

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

November 25, 2003

5:00 PM

Chairman O'Neil called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen O'Neil, Shea, Smith, Lopez

Absent: Alderman Wihby

Messrs: Chief Jaskolka, K. Clougherty, K. Sheppard, R. MacKenzie,
R. Ludwig, R. Johnson, T. Arnold, D. Mires,

Chairman O'Neil stated I would like to take a few items out of order here so we can get a few staff people home at a reasonable time this evening.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

Resolution and budget authorization authorizing transfer and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$134,536 (Federal) for CIP 210503 Homeless Health Care.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to approve the resolution and budget authorization.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 9 of the agenda:

Resolution and budget authorization authorizing transfer and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$10,364 (Federal) for CIP 210404 Homeless Health Care.

On motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez it was voted to approve the resolution and budget authorization.

Alderman Lopez stated I would just like to make a comment on behalf of the committee that we are on in raising money. Dave Nixon who is the Chairman is doing an excellent job and various companies...Ocean today gave \$45,000 to the senior center and...

Chairman O'Neil interjected I think you are on the wrong item. We are on Item 9.

Alderman Lopez stated well I will just finish up on Item 8. I was so excited today to get the \$25,000 from Catholic Medical Center. People in the community are supporting the senior center.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 10 of the agenda:

Resolution and budget authorizations authorizing transfer and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$217,206 (EPD) for CIP 712003 FBI Recuperator Project.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Smith it was voted to approve the resolution and budget authorizations.

Chairman O'Neil stated Chief Jaskolka is here specifically for the tabled Item 20. Does anybody want to take that off the table?

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to remove Item 20 from the table.

Communication from Alderman Lopez regarding the feasibility of having sponsors for Manchester police vehicles.

Chief John Jaskolka stated this whole matter has become a very hot topic in the police field. Earlier on this year there was a lot of controversy and a lot of police periodicals regarding sponsorship for the cruisers. I am very much aware of the much needed funding to replace the aging cruisers that we currently have at the Manchester Police Department. If you recall during the budget hearing earlier this year I told you we needed 23 new cars. To date, five cars have been replaced. Four by the City and one by a total independent insurance company. Currently I have 17 cars that have over 100,000 miles on them. I have several others that are in excess of 90,000 miles and I have 12 cars that are over 7 years old. Currently, I probably need 27 cruisers to be replaced so the numbers have gone up since the last budget hearing. At present much like my operating budget for last year for vehicle repairs with only five months into the budget we have expended 80% of the budget repairing these vehicles. It is very costly to keep these vehicles up and running. I am also sure that the seemingly harmless proposal of private cruiser sponsorship is a very appealing means for the City to replace the cruisers. I understand that you as Aldermen need to find ways to save money and to replace these cars but I have to ask you at what cost. I would ask you to remember that the private business areas are cognizant of how effective it is to advertise on police cruisers. They realize how much money they will make and how much impact

advertising on a professional cruiser would have on the citizens of the City. However, a public entity, especially an entity like the Police Department that may some day have to investigate the business practices of these companies should not be advertising for these companies. I should interject at this time that we do have a policy that does not allow our members to advertise or endorse any product or service. However, what better way can you think of to legitimize and emphasize a product than to use a professional police cruiser as a means of advertisement? I can't understand why the Committee feels the need for today's professional police officers to have to go around on a daily basis and advertise pizza shops, burger joints, deodorant, underwear or even toilet paper on their cruisers. Ads like this emblazoned on professional police cruisers would not in any way enhance our recruiting efforts, our professionalism or the morale within the department itself. Clearly I believe that as public officials we can do better than having the State's largest Police Department vying for the public's attention by advertising businesses or services. Currently I can discipline an officer for accepting a gratuity. They are required to submit a note and in most cases if at all possible the gratuity is returned. What are we telling this officer when he is driving around in a cruiser that has been given to the department through a gratuity. The line officers by SOP cannot accept a gratuity in the form of a cup of coffee or a free meal but the department can accept a \$24,000 gratuity. What are we telling the officers at this point and I ask where the professionalism is. It is our SOP that officers cannot recommend a certain wrecker service or restaurant in the City. Rather when somebody asks for a place to eat we will usually ask them what type of restaurant they are looking for and we will suggest several. However, these officers would now be driving around advertising a specific restaurant on the cruiser itself. Police departments work hard to make their cruiser display the professional image of their department. A professional cruiser should not look like a NASCAR vehicle and that is essentially what the company does that puts these advertisements on the cruisers. They have large emblems on the hood and the sides so the cars look like NASCAR vehicles as opposed to a regular cruiser. Then I have to ask you should we advertise tobacco products or alcohol that we come out against to the school children? Should the cruisers be driving around with these? Should we stop this type of advertising? Is it discrimination if we do so and will the City Solicitor's Office have to defend the City against lawsuits? What about major drug companies who sell their drugs legally, however, people abuse them and then sell them on the street. Billboards, I think everybody agrees, are eyesores but they are expected to be seen on public buildings, perhaps on buses and perhaps on taxicabs. It is simply unprofessional on a police cruiser. Major companies know that this is a great and economical way to advertise their products with the endorsement of their local police department. This is, however, totally unacceptable in the professional police field. I am not totally aware of how the line item was taken out of the budget to fund police cruisers. I do remember as a young police officer our cruisers were replaced every year and then it went to

every two years. Now like I said we have cruisers that are seven or eight years old that we still have out on the street. I don't know how we have come to the point as City officials that we have to look to burger joints or pizza places or drug companies to fund our cruisers. Obviously this is a very compassionate issue with my department and myself and what I am asking you is not to demoralize the professionalism of the police officers I have in this department by having them drive around in marked billboards. Finally I ask that you find a more professional means of purchasing police cruisers for the City's police officers. These cars are out there 24 hours a day, 7 days a week and are subject to the hardest driving conditions known to man. Police cruisers need to be replaced a minimum of every two years and a maximum of every three years or somewhere in the vicinity of 80,000 to 100,000 miles and for no other reason than the safety of the police officers who are out there every day driving these cruisers. Thank you.

Chairman O'Neil stated before I take questions for the Chief and maybe the Finance Officer can just nod his head but Kevin if I recall during our budget presentation some cash will get freed up starting in next year's budget, which would allow us to start addressing our fleet...maybe you want to come up to address that quickly. If I recall your comments, you would like to see us start addressing our fleet issues in the City with some of that money. It had to do with the fiscal year conversion I believe.

Mr. Kevin Clougherty responded that is right. We would like to see the...not windfall but the trough that is created by not having to pay the debt on the fiscal year conversion bonds going to capital reserve funds initially to build up capital reserves for vehicles and for computer equipment and over a five year period you would be able to build up a nice fund and you would be able to take care of some of the needs that the Chief has. It is just that one year, one cycle we are trying to get through so I think down the road there is something for them but it is going to take us a year to get there.

Alderman Lopez stated I honor your remarks, Chief. This idea is throughout the national cities magazine where this has happened in other cities where they have been sponsored and at the same time some of the comments you made in reference to what could be on those vehicles could be limited as to what could be on them. I do appreciate that. I do appreciate that you need 23 vehicles and we are working on that. You do need the vehicles. Kevin, you made a statement and I want to clarify that statement to make sure that there is no doubt because that question was asked once before of Randy Sherman. Are you telling me that the fund that we have established can be used to buy police vehicles?

Mr. Clougherty responded not the bond.

Alderman Lopez replied I am not talking about bonding. I am talking about the extra cash that comes in as surplus that we put in a one time account.

Mr. Clougherty responded no. What we are saying is you should be reserving those dollars for use for economic development and larger capital projects than your fleet.

Alderman Lopez replied well maybe I am misunderstanding you. Could you explain how and where we would get the money...

Chairman O'Neil interjected Kevin what is the debt service on that bond.

Mr. Clougherty stated right now you are paying about \$5 million a year in debt service for the fiscal year conversion bonds. Now you have been paying that for the last 12 years. You are going to stop making payments because remember those bonds were 12 year bonds. We issued them I think in 1993 so we are at the point where those bonds are going to be paid off in another year or so. That \$5 million in the operating budget...don't reduce your taxes but take that \$5 million and use that to pay cash for the things that you haven't been able to pay cash for in a long time like your vehicles and your computers. What you do is you take a piece of that the first year, let's say \$1 million and put it towards it and put the rest in a capital reserve. You do that same process over a three, four or five year period and your capital reserve is at a sufficient size that it is earning enough interest to start paying for those things over time. That is how most other cities fund their projects. That is what we would encourage you to do is use that capacity not to raise more debt but to pay for some of the things you should be paying for in cash by setting up capital reserves and you balance that over time.

Chairman O'Neil asked am I correct that you could even use it to start paying cash for items like garbage trucks and fire trucks that you have been bonding currently.

Mr. Clougherty answered correct. Initially that is how you would start to do that. You would try to wratch it up like \$1 million, \$3 million in your trust fund and eventually the trust fund gets to a size that it is generating enough interest maybe not in this environment but over the next couple of years when the market comes back and over time you have a capital reserve to take care of your vehicles forever.

Alderman Forest stated as you all know I have been an advocate of replacing those police cruisers for the two years I have been an Alderman and we still haven't got them. This Board took one step forward this year by taking the request for police cruisers out of a line item and bringing it into the CIP organization so they could get them faster and get their cruisers repaired. I do agree with Chief Jaskolka about the advertising on police cruisers. I was in Florida a couple of weeks ago

and all over Florida their cruisers have advertising and they look terrible. They look like taxicabs. I don't think we should be doing it and I am asking this Committee not to move forward with that.

Alderman Smith stated I really think the intent was to try and get some revenue so we could get the cruisers on the road. I know this was brought up by my colleague to my left but I have to agree with the Police Chief and so forth that I think we should defeat this tonight and right away.

Alderman Shea moved to receive and file this item. Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Gatsas stated I was just looking to Kevin so that he could explain...I thought that \$5 million that we expired was going towards the school project.

Mr. Clougherty responded remember there is a trough on the general fund side and on the school side. We have one on our side as well.

Alderman Gatsas asked and when does that expire.

Mr. Clougherty answered I believe it is 2005, the end of 2005. They were 12-year bonds and I think we issued them in 1993. I could go back and check but it is in that timeframe.

Alderman Gatsas asked so none of that money is being used to reduce the debt.

Mr. Clougherty answered no.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil stated I know that Alderman Garrity wanted to sit in on the discussion of Item 15. We have about 10 minutes. Kevin Sheppard are you going to speak to Item 15?

Communication from Frank Thomas, Public Works Director,
recommending the purchase of a Mobile Sales Unit to be utilized for the
removal of graffiti (approximate cost of \$9,000.00).

Mr. Kevin Sheppard stated at the request of this Board or this Committee we went out and took a look at different areas that had graffiti removal programs. Lowell, MA being one of them and Essex County I believe in Massachusetts being another one and based on the success of those the Director came up with a

recommendation that we feel will be successful in the City of Manchester and that is included as part of your package. The pressure washer, which is mounted on a trailer with a heater. There are solvents that need to go along with that to take the graffiti off the walls. The employee and the vehicle. We are looking at that as a package for a graffiti removal program. Lowell has done this and they have been very successful. They have a full-time employee and they say they can react or resolve graffiti issues within 24 hours. It has been a successful program down there.

Chairman O'Neil asked just for clarification, Kevin, the recommendation from the department is a package. The vehicle, the pressure washer, the supplies and the employee?

Mr. Sheppard answered correct.

Alderman Garrity asked could the vehicle and the pressure washer come out of CIP funds.

Mr. Sheppard answered if there is money available in CIP cash. We oversee the MER funds and there is no cash available.

Alderman Garrity stated I know but isn't there a shelf life that it has to have like 10 years if it comes out of CIP funding or something. Bob, could you help me with that?

Mr. Robert MacKenzie responded we are aware and had brought to the Committee probably about six months ago some of the balances from projects and the Committee discussed at the time holding back some of that money, some of that cash possibly for graffiti. That total is about \$17,000. I think to get the vehicle and the mobile washer would be about \$32,000. Is that right Kevin?

Mr. Sheppard answered correct.

Mr. MacKenzie stated so we are about halfway there.

Alderman Garrity stated I believe this is the program that the City needs. I think this issue has been discussed enough and researched enough and studied enough. I think it is time that we made a commitment to deal with our problem with graffiti. I would hope that the Board would support adding more funds into the CIP to bring it up to \$32,000 and then we will deal with the paint and solvent supplies and the employee this fiscal year. I strongly believe that this is the way we should go. I have polled some of the people down in my ward and they would be in favor of spending some dollars to take care of the graffiti problem in Ward 9 anyway.

Alderman Lopez stated I believe all of the Aldermen received correspondence from Dave Scannell who has been working on graffiti and a release from the businesses in order to go in and take care of it. Have you received anything in reference to correspondence from Dave Scannell on graffiti that he has been working on for six or eight months?

Mr. Sheppard responded I personally haven't seen anything.

Alderman Lopez stated also Intown has been working on it and they have a pressure washer that they bought also, and different items that have been discussed as far as graffiti. Have you seen any correspondence anything from Intown in reference to that?

Mr. Sheppard responded only that we are familiar with their program and their program addresses Intown only.

Alderman Lopez asked do you have any feedback from anyone who attended the meetings with Intown on some of the things like having a 24-hour hotline like the dispatch area to report graffiti.

Mr. Sheppard answered nothing in writing.

Alderman Lopez stated first of all I am not for hiring anybody else. That is why this package I will not vote for. In the correspondence that you have here is it true that what Lowell does is have people work on the weekends and get paid overtime to **do** the graffiti?

Mr. Sheppard answered that was not discussed with them. Mr. Tierney...well two of our people went down and saw the machine and spoke to the people. It was our assumption that they were full-time during the week because that is when they went down and met with these people and saw the demonstration.

Alderman Lopez stated well for the record they have a union person whose job description has been changed and could be changed in the City of Manchester and necessary funds so that individual can be paid overtime and take care of the graffiti on the weekends. They also...Mr. MacKenzie they use \$60,000 from CDBG funds down in Lowell. That is an area that I don't expect you to have an answer to tonight but can CDBG money be utilized in any part of this?

Mr. MacKenzie responded we have discussed that possibility and it is possible to use it within City eligible areas. The problem becomes one of paperwork in that HUD requires us to document usage of these funds so they would have to actually

document the locations and we would have to keep a record for HUD of all of the locations. That does become kind of a logistical nightmare.

Alderman Lopez asked, Kevin, are you saying and I agree that you need a power I don't have any problem with the pressure washer but are we also saying that this individual is going to take care of Traffic and Parks at the same time.

Mr. Sheppard answered this person would react to I believe any graffiti that was brought to our attention. We would work with other departments.

Alderman Lopez asked and he would be responsible for the entire City.

Mr. Sheppard answered yes that would be the intent.

Alderman Lopez stated I do agree wholeheartedly that we need something like Intown does but I also believe that we have a lot of people, a lot of laborers who are painters in the City and if we are going to do something along this line I would suggest that the HR Director have input into this and we look at the job description before we just package something through to the Board. We are reacting. For example, we have taken money away from Parks. We never had this problem before. It goes with the weeding and it goes with graffiti. We have just cut the budget. That is what we have done. So I am just saying that I think this whole thing has been worked too fast. The pressure washer I have no problem with but I think that taking the package and hiring more employees in the City is the wrong way to go when we have plenty of painters in the City where we can job descriptions to those. We can add money for them to go out on the weekend and turn around and do the graffiti. I am not in favor of the package but I am in favor of the pressure washer.

Alderman Shea stated I know Kevin that you mentioned just to have the pressure washer would not make sense because obviously it would be purchased and there would be no one available to use it.

Mr. Sheppard responded I am not saying there would be no one to use it. Obviously if there were times when someone was available we could potentially use it. Our intent is to do the program correctly and if we are going to do the program correctly we want to react to graffiti. We don't want to have a list similar to stumps throughout the City, tree stumps. We have a list that when we have the opportunity in between projects we may go out and get some done but I think the intent of this program was to be able to react to graffiti in a reasonable time period and I guess it is our opinion that with just a piece of equipment we couldn't guarantee that.

Alderman Shea stated what I am trying to say though is if the Committee were to purchase an instrument to remove the graffiti what do you see as a consequence.

Mr. Sheppard replied there would be no guarantee as to reaction time for when we got graffiti...you know our priorities during the summer months are street reconstruction, street resurfacing and items such as that. We have taken on the maintenance for the riverwalk like cutting the grass and putting the asphalt down. It is just that we have a lot of other things added to us and what we are saying is if we are going to do it right let's do it with a full-time employee who can dedicate his time to it.

Alderman Shea asked, Bob, was there any money set aside specifically for the removal of graffiti. I thought that we set aside \$15,000. Is that correct?

Mr. MacKenzie answered there is presently \$17,000 that is earmarked but not fully passed by the Board. It is set aside right now.

Alderman Shea asked so any money that was set aside several years ago for graffiti went back into the general fund. If my memory serves me correctly several years ago I was in charge of the graffiti committee and there was \$10,000 allotted for graffiti removal but because of the fact that this was done through cooperation with Youth Services and other departments we didn't really use much of that so over the course of time did that go back into the general fund?

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes. If it was not a CIP account then it would have lapsed as operating expenses.

Alderman Shea asked so any special account like that would obviously be gone.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I believe so but I would actually like to check.

Alderman Shea asked so if you don't use it you lose it right.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes.

Alderman Forest stated I am not sure if Kevin can answer this or somebody from the staff but if this thing gets implemented will the graffiti removal just be on City property or would we do it on private property.

Mr. Sheppard answered I guess that is a policy that the Board of Mayor and Aldermen would have to set. I know that other cities do private property. There is a waiver that private property owners actually sign for the City to allow them to remove it.

Alderman Forest stated the other thing I want to ask is if we do implement it for private property is there a way to get reimbursement for doing it so we wouldn't lose money on it.

Alderman Garrity stated it is not my intent to have someone hired down at the Highway Department next month for graffiti. Obviously we have to go through the process. I don't mind if it goes through Human Resources and things like that but it is something I think we should concentrate on for the next fiscal year.

Alderman Smith stated Kevin I think we are all talking about the cost. Am I correct now? The total package would be about \$81,000?

Mr. Sheppard answered correct and that is what I think Bob alluded to. The first two items, the vehicle and the pressure washer could come out of the CIP budget in the next fiscal year. The solvent supplies would be in the Highway Department operating budget and the employee would be in the operating budget also.

Alderman Smith stated Kevin I am quite concerned about the graffiti. I go across the bridges and the markers are all marked up and all of the phone conduit panels are marked up and traffic boxes and so forth. We have been talking about this for two years. We have to address it but I have to agree with Alderman Lopez that I think as far as a full-time employee with benefits that should go to the Human Resources Committee to be addressed and maybe we can work on the first three items.

Alderman DeVries stated Kevin I certainly concur with what Alderman Forest said. If we are looking at this the potential revenue would be if we are using it on private property and could develop what those fees might be. I was also wondering if there was a potential revenue utilizing this in conjunction with the Fire Department when they have gas spills or oil spills. I know that Clean Harbor comes in with a pressure washer to help facilitate that. It is a little bit more involved than what you are talking about but with additional training I think there is substantial savings because I think if we check with Clean Harbors there would be substantial revenues because those fees are quite high. If it wouldn't be laborious in training to facilitate it.

Mr. Sheppard responded we would have to check. I know there are quite a few certifications to do that kind of work but that is something we can definitely look into and consider.

Alderman DeVries stated it might justify the salary for us.

Chairman O'Neil stated I just want to make a couple of comments. Number one I agree with Alderman Garrity. This is an issue throughout the City of Manchester. It hits all 12 wards and even if we are only addressing public facilities, it is a major problem. Whether it is parks or whether it is schools...any municipal building. This is a problem around the City. I know when I was in Pittsburgh at one point I spoke to some people and they have a very aggressive program where they have a truck that gets out right away and addresses the problem. I don't see the Police Chief still here but my understanding from those in law enforcement is you want to address it immediately. You don't want it to wait a month or two months to get addressed but you want to get at it right away. I support the plan as it is presented. I think we need to do some work in figuring out how we can come up with the money and hopefully we can do something before the new fiscal year begins. I would like to see us refer the employee portion to the HR Committee for review and recommendation and refer the issues of the vehicle costs and pressure washer to the Deputy Director to work with CIP staff to see how we may be able to address that sooner than later.

Alderman Shea stated just by point of clarification, the comments made by Alderman Forest and Alderman DeVries when I was involved with the Graffiti Committee we did run into concerns on the part of private ownership. That is to say many refused to allow anybody to go onto their property and remove graffiti. I want to make that point clear because obviously there were others that did not but some preferred not to remove the graffiti. They said we don't want anybody bothering our property and if we are going to take it off we will do it ourselves. Some did and some didn't so there is as you say a concern there regarding that. In regards to your proposal, I have no objection to that. I think that we should move in a direction that is positive making sure that we do cover all the bases.

Alderman Smith moved to accept the first three items as presented by Kevin Sheppard and refer the last item, the full-time employee to the Human Resources.

Chairman O'Neil asked in regards to the first three items is that something that you want to ask the Highway Department to work with the CIP staff and Finance Office to identify funds.

Alderman Smith answered yes and I think probably we could move on this right away. With winter coming we can probably get the program started.

Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Lopez asked with winter coming we have plenty of time but the pressure washer, can our vehicles carry that. All they have to do is put a hitch on it right?

Mr. Sheppard answered right. Our vehicles could tow it.

Alderman Lopez stated I was wondering if since we have \$17,000 or \$18,000 do we want it to go to Committee or do we want to authorize them to buy the pressure washer since we have that money.

Chairman O'Neil responded I am okay with that but I am hoping they don't have extra vehicles sitting over there waiting to tow this thing and that they really need the vehicle to do it. Am I correct?

Mr. Sheppard replied that is what we are asking for. I mean at times there is a vehicle sitting there and we could add the pressure washer but without the commitment that we would be able to react and if you start a program you don't want to start it and set it up for failure at the beginning I don't believe.

Alderman Lopez stated I just want to make a point and maybe it will go to Committee or whatever afterwards but in answer to a question about how Lowell started this they created an ordinance of a \$100 fine. That didn't work and there are problems getting on...I suggest that you get together with David Scannell because he does have a release that they worked on for six months and I think it is something that you could use. I am just pointing out that if you had the pressure washer at this time and there was some extra money like we have \$17,000 then situations might come up between now and when we solve the whole problem whereby we could use a vehicle on a weekend and send a laborer out there and do this stuff. That is all it is is labor work.

Chairman O'Neil asked are you suggesting that we recommend to the Board to use \$9,000 to purchase the pressure washer and take the balance of the money and make it available for overtime for Highway employees. Is that what you are suggesting?

Alderman Lopez answered I am suggesting that we do that at this time in the interim because we all know that we need the pressure washer to do some of this stuff.

Chairman O'Neil asked how about if we take a vote on the original motion and bring that up as a second motion.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion to approve items one through three of the proposal and refer item four to the Human Resources Committee. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Shea asked the motion made included vehicle costs and what you are saying is something different.

Chairman O'Neil answered well I think what Alderman Lopez is suggesting and I don't want to speak for him is this may still take us a little time to work out where are we going to get the money to purchase the vehicle, etc. What he is saying is we have \$17,000 available. Let's purchase the pressure washer or authorize after full Board approval the department to purchase the pressure washer and possibly take some of the balance that is left of that \$17,000 and weather permitting maybe pay some people on weekends to go out with an existing vehicle and try to address some of the more...

Alderman Shea interjected and in the meantime continue to move forward on the rest of the program.

Chairman O'Neil answered yes. We would identify how we can purchase a vehicle and add another employee.

Alderman Smith stated if we don't have a vehicle available we are not going to be able to get out there. I am saying that I know in the Highway Department there are only a few trucks with trailer hitches and if they are being used for snow removal or back street plowing then you have a problem.

Chairman O'Neil responded I would think that if they are doing snow removal and plowing and that we would probably be looking to grab every body possible to do that so there probably wouldn't be any graffiti removal going on at that time. I think it is a step that they may have a pick-up available on a weekend and they could have a person come in and plug away at this a little bit.

Alderman Smith stated it is like having a cart with nothing to pull it.

Chairman O'Neil responded I do think this is a step in the right direction but continue to identify how we can purchase a vehicle as soon as possible.

Alderman Lopez moved to authorize \$9,000 to purchase the pressure washer.

Alderman Smith asked if we are getting the pressure washer it would be nice to get the supplies for it with the \$8,000 that is left.

Chairman O'Neil replied that is fine. Are you including that in your motion Alderman Lopez?

Alderman Lopez answered yes I will include that. Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Shea stated you mentioned before when I asked you, Kevin, that it didn't make any sense to do that. Isn't that what you said? You said we would not be able to do anything with that.

Mr. Sheppard responded yes. I would ask that if there is \$17,000 and the Aldermen on the Committee want to get this program off the ground allow us to buy the pressure washer and allow us to buy some materials...that \$8,000 is estimated for a year and recommend that some of the money be used for overtime to get some of this done. We are not saying that we would do it all on overtime but I just want to make sure that money can be spent for labor. Is the motion for potential overtime, equipment and the supplies?

Alderman Shea asked when do you visualize this taking place. How long will it be before you get the pressure washer? A couple of months?

Mr. Sheppard answered I think we could probably get one within a month but part of the problem is that we are into the winter at that point.

Alderman Shea asked do you have a place to store it. You have to if the snow comes and you can't use the vehicle for whatever right?

Mr. Sheppard answered we would have to find a place to store it, right. It would be available. It is not something that can't be used during the winter but it is probably nothing...even though it has a heater it is going to freeze once it...

Chairman O'Neil interjected are you okay with this little interim plan. You are on record that you believe the right thing to do is to buy the vehicle, the pressure washer, the supplies and the employee.

Mr. Sheppard responded correct.

Chairman O'Neil stated and that we should not move forward with the program unless we are willing to make that commitment.

Mr. Sheppard answered correct because like I said I feel you would be setting this up for failure and our response time can't be guaranteed.

Alderman Lopez stated I would have to say that that is one plan that you brought forward. I think more discussion has to be done in reference to how we are going to operate this plan. There are plenty of plans around this city and there are plenty

of individuals in this City that are painters that can do this stuff. It is a matter of what you want to do is to have five days a week somebody going out there and doing graffiti and I don't think that is going to happen, therefore, the way other plans work is you provide the necessary funds for on the weekend where there is nothing going on and two labor people or one labor person goes out there and does it. I think you have to look at other plans. Having ice cream and cake at the same time is not always the best thing.

Mr. Sheppard answered we will take a look at that as an option.

Chairman O'Neil stated I think there is enough work to keep a person busy five days a week. I don't know if that is 12 months of the year but pretty close to 12 months of the year in my opinion with the amount of graffiti I see around the City just on public property.

Alderman Shea stated we are coming into the winter season and we are going to be tying up financial resources and then when it comes time to do the full and complete plan we are going to have to be tying things together. My thinking is if you are going to do it why don't we do it right rather than just doing it haphazardly? That is the only comment I have. I am not saying we should get a pressure washer and paint and store them some place because we all know that once the snow starts to fly everything sort of stops and we are not going to go around with a pressure washer taking graffiti off. That doesn't seem logical to me.

Chairman O'Neil stated we have not taken a vote yet on an interim plan. I think Alderman Shea's point is very well taken. Let's get the whole plan going and...

Alderman Shea interjected I move to table this until we can have more discussion if somebody wants to remove the other motion.

Alderman Lopez stated I withdraw my motion and go with the original motion that Alderman Smith made to let the staff work it out and refer the employee part to the Human Resources Committee. I will go along with Alderman Shea.

Alderman Smith withdrew his second.

Chairman O'Neil stated okay we took a vote already on the original motion so that stands and brings closure to this issue.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Presentation by Parks & Recreation on the status of the Derryfield Park Rehabilitation project.

Mr. Ronald Ludwig stated just to clarify I believe this is the...we have a lot of Derryfields here tonight and this is the Derryfield Park section first just for the record. To my right I guess everybody knows him but I will introduce him again is Ron Johnson. At the last CIP Committee meeting we were asked to come in and do a small presentation relative to the Derryfield Park Master Plan. This is an in-house Master Plan that we have done and had in place for the last few years and there are several phases to this project. The first phase was to do the entry drive and also to do the playground, which is pretty much in place. The second phase is to look at the rear portion of the park with the reconstruction of an existing soccer field, a couple of softball fields and some tennis courts. What I would like to do is the second part of this presentation there was a request from this Committee some time ago to go through quickly at the end of the Derryfield presentation, which will take no more than a couple of minutes to identify some other parcels of land throughout the City that could be in current use or that may not be in any particular use right now. As you now there is a shortage of open space for us to build more facilities and we are going to more artificial surfaces at this point, which is a wonderful thing thanks to this Board. We have also moved forward in trying to identify other areas by means of even looking to purchase property but the cost has been prohibitive in that regard. It is a difficult process when we look for additional open space throughout the City. With that, I think that what I want to add is that the information in the second half of the presentation is strictly for information and does not convey to anyone in any particular ward that this is something that is even going to happen. This is just for consideration. We throw these items out on the table so you will see pros up there and you will see cons up there relative to each area that we have looked at. We have done no engineering at any of these places. Most of this is done from the aerial fly overs that we get from the Planning Department so what you are going to see is also somewhat suspect in terms of can it actually fit in a particular area where you may see a soccer field overlaid over a wooded area with trees when we get to that portion. So for the people who are watching and for the members of this Committee and members of the press these are strictly concepts that we have come up with and ideas and that is the way we would like you to deal with it. With that, I will turn it over to Ron Johnson.

Mr. Ron Johnson stated as Ron mentioned we looked at several different issues. I have a Powerpoint presentation. We have come up with...to give you a representation of what has happened at Derryfield Park this past year and then also looking to the future. Derryfield Park, just a little bit of background. It was established in 1889. It was originally part of the City farm. It is currently at 76 acres and it abuts a lot of the other City open space land including McIntyre Ski Area, the City reservoir, Derryfield Country Club and Hillside Middle School. It is considered a multi-use recreational facility. It has athletic fields for baseball,

football and soccer, a cross-country running course. We had tennis courts originally and they are scheduled to be reconstructed. There is a new playground...

Chairman O'Neil interjected this is not what came in the package, correct.

Mr. Johnson answered correct. I just took out some excerpts for the package.

Chairman O'Neil asked can we get a copy of the presentation.

Mr. Johnson answered sure. So this shows Derryfield Park right here in the center. Here is McIntyre Ski Area just to the north. The Derryfield Country Club is down in this area and then Stevens Park so it is a large block of green space right in the City. Phase I, which was completed last year, as Ron mentioned included the entry road, new sidewalks, a parking lot...we only have base pavement. We worked with the Highway Department and they did do the paving there. It is that base pavement currently. We put in new amenities including guardrails and site lighting. The large playground is there and we did some landscaping. The total funding for that was \$400,000 and it was broken out as shown at the bottom of the slide with bond funding and we did use some Community Development Block Grant funds for the accessibility improvements of the sidewalk and the playground. Phase I, just to orient you here is the entrance coming off of Bridge Street and this is the new entry road. This is the new playground and these are the parking lots. If you have been going up Bridge Street you will see those new improvements. So that was Phase I. Here are some existing conditions. The park was in pretty poor shape. The tennis courts were pretty well deteriorated and the only playground we had back in 2002 was this swing set on the backside of Reservoir Avenue. Phase II, which we put in this year's CIP plan, we wanted to complete the final paving of what was installed last year. There were some additional improvements for a shelter for a picnic table. We put in the footings and the pad for it, but we would like to put in the shelter and some other amenities such as picnic tables and benches. We want to reconstruct the tennis courts on the backside of Reservoir Avenue and renovate what we call the lower Derryfield athletic fields and then continue some of the Park Drive improvements and continue with landscaping. We had requested this year \$500,000 in the CIP and just to show you a little bit this is the Phase II. We would go to the back portion of the park. This is Reservoir Avenue and Hillside Middle School. We would locate the tennis courts here, again renovate the fields here and then put in some additional parking and access on the backside. That is what we had requested for this year for Derryfield Park and this slide just shows you some of those areas. This is where the tennis courts would be located along Reservoir Avenue and then this is the existing playground and we are looking to

put a new shelter over in this area. It is pretty wide open and there is no shade relief.

Alderman Shea asked when you say you have requested it do you mean that you were given that amount to complete this project or that you requested it. When you say requested it would you define what you mean?

Mr. Johnson answered it was identified in our CIP plan as a request and in the current budget...I think it was discussed at the last CIP meeting there was that note that the funds would come from the Riverfront Development and I think that was going to be looked into and discussed a little bit more. It was identified in the current CIP plan.

Alderman Shea asked so basically there is no money per say unless money were to be forthcoming from the Riverfront project. Is that accurate?

Mr. Johnson answered right. We haven't received the official start-up. The funds haven't come in through the Finance Department. It is identified in the CIP plan but no funds have been started up at this point.

Alderman Shea asked so this is all theoretical as far as predicated upon the \$500,000.

Mr. Johnson answered that is correct. These are some shots of what we call lower Derryfield. This is looking up toward the reservoir and the Weston Observatory. This field we would like to renovate. Fencing needs to be improved. We would like to do some regrading of the field and this is that same field looking out toward the City. It currently has two softball fields on either corner and it is overlaid with a soccer field. It does need some drainage improvements also. We also in our long-range plan...we haven't done what we call an official Master Plan. We have done some conceptual planning and come up with a funding scenario over the next five years that would take us from 2005 through 2009 and in our long-range plan we did request \$500,000 for each of the next five years. Those would include improvements to the Al Lemire Field, which is the existing baseball field out in front. A lot of the parking in the back part of the park needs to be reconstructed. Portions of Reservoir Drive and Circular Drive, which go around the park are in really poor shape and need some drainage improvements. Also, the trail network that leads up to Weston Observatory needs some work and then we have had some recent requests to look at the Observatory itself for some improvement. For the future phases again we could look at doing some additional parking on the backside, improve these road systems here...this is the Al Lemire field here. It has the old bleacher system that dates back to the WPA era that was put in with the old concrete abutments. That needs some work. One of the big items we have

to look at is the intersection of the main entrance of the park out onto Bridge Street. If you have ever tried to get out there at pretty much any time during the day and head out toward Mammoth Road it is pretty difficult to make that turn so like Livingston Park we might have to consider a traffic light at that point. These are just some shots of those areas. Again, here is the Al Lemire field where we would like to do some improvements. It is currently used quite a bit by Trinity High School. Also, the Pop Warner team uses it and youth baseball uses it during the summer. You can see the baseball field is overlaid on the outfield. These shots were taken not too long ago and again here is that intersection out onto Bridge Street where we need to look at some of the accessibility into the park itself and also maybe the issue of the traffic light. I think this is a shot from our playground dedication last May. I think the improvements that have been completed to date have been well received. I know that we have had a lot of good comments. We worked on this particular project also with the Visiting Nurse's Association and they fundraised to purchase this piece of equipment, which is a handicapped accessible swing where a wheelchair can actually get into that unit and the children in wheelchairs can also enjoy the playground so it has been well received. That sums up what has taken place at Derryfield Park. Before I go on to the next portion I would like to see if there are any questions about Derryfield Park and what has been done to date or what we plan for the future.

Alderman Lopez stated we need to clarify something on this \$500,000. It is not in theory that we got \$500,000. We put \$500,000 in the budget for Parks & Recreation to do Phase II. Is that correct?

Mr. Johnson responded I would have to defer I guess to the Planning Department. That is the footnote that is in the CIP plan. How those monies come about I think we would have to defer either to Planning or the Finance Department.

Alderman Lopez stated well let's clear it up now so we don't have any problems later on.

Mr. MacKenzie stated there is no money there now. The Board did not authorize bonds for this, which is the normal way we pay for park projects. At the time the CIP budget was being prepared it was felt possible that the developer had proposed that they would contribute somewhere between \$500,000 and \$700,000 to move Singer Park to somewhere in the City. So it is felt that since there was no money for this phase of Derryfield perhaps the two could be married – the Derryfield Park improvements and the Singer Park venue. There is no money at the present time. It was earmarked in the CIP that the developer could provide \$500,000 or improvements in lieu of the cash. That has not been started up yet because no monies have come through from the developer. The full Board would

still have to approve the start-up, which is the budget authorization. That has not been done yet.

Alderman Lopez stated I know that Bill Jabjiniak is here and I don't know if he is prepared...I know he just got back from a bereavement leave and my sympathies go out to your family.

Mr. William Jabjiniak stated in the Memorandum of Understanding it is listed that the developer is responsible for relocating Singer Family Park. At the time that the developer was in front of us and I can't even tell you when that was at the moment, he did talk about in lieu of really recreating that field a cash contribution. He was looking for direction from you as a Board. We have gone back to him since the last CIP meeting and asked what are his numbers and where is he going and he asked again if he would have the ability to look at what site the City has chosen to try to recreate that field. That is pretty much where things are at with the developer at this point in time.

Alderman Lopez asked when you say recreate the field, didn't we have a discussion that if we didn't want the field recreated we could get cash.

Mr. Jabjiniak answered if that is the direction then I would simply point to giving him that directive and lets finalize a number. He has not zeroed in on a number. He talked about on March 11 a range minus the cost of relocating the bleachers. The number is still very much out there. We are looking for some direction on exactly what you are looking for for him to do.

Alderman Lopez responded I would like to have the cash but I will let the other Aldermen speak for themselves.

Alderman Shea stated so that everything is clear in my mind, if he were to give us the cash do we have to pay him back the cash. In other words, the understanding was when we first talked about this and it has been documented in the local paper as well as told to the Aldermen and mentioned at the last Aldermanic meeting by Alderman Gatsas who brought it up and I certainly give him credit for that. Would we have to pay him back for these monies that he is going to provide to the City? Is that part of what we would have to do?

Mr. Jabjiniak answered I don't believe so. I would defer to my agreement and I am not in a position to refer to that in detail tonight.

Alderman Shea responded well you would have to get something from this individual in writing. Obviously words are not apparently being understood. If it

were a case of him being willing to put up the cash, I would agree with Alderman Lopez.

Chairman O'Neil stated I just want to make it clear that the intent of the meeting tonight is not necessarily to talk about the baseball deal. That belongs in another committee. The intent of the meeting tonight was to update the Committee. We had never seen the Master Plan on Derryfield Park. We have been talking about Derryfield Park and the Committee had never seen the Master Plan. That is one of the things. Do we like things that are in there or do we not like things that are in there and direct staff to move forward. I think we can have a discussion about the money but that is not where we are supposed to be tonight. That belongs in another committee.

Alderman Lopez responded I agree with you that we have a baseball committee. The only thing is that I would ask this Committee to make a recommendation to that committee that we would like to have the cash in order to continue with Phase II of Derryfield Park.

Chairman O'Neil asked one of the questions is is Derryfield Park where Singer Park is getting relocated. That is one of the things that the City has failed to reach an agreement on. Is there another park in the City and I think that is part of their next presentation correct?

Mr. Johnson answered correct.

Alderman Gatsas stated I believe this Board was pretty clear with what they were going to do with Singer Park. As a matter of fact I will take you back to some of the comments that you made on March 11. You were talking that the venue at Gill Stadium would accommodate the things that were at Singer Park and that the field we were relocating to Derryfield was a soccer field that could be used by Hillside and other youth soccer leagues. Your understanding was that that could be accommodated at Gill Stadium.

Chairman O'Neil responded or other facilities.

Alderman Gatsas stated right but that would be...

Chairman O'Neil interjected I would agree with that. You are quoting me correctly.

Alderman Gatsas stated well it is only because the City Clerk did such a good job about getting us this information. The conversation really started on March 11 and what it started discussing...

Alderman Shea interjected what page are you on.

Alderman Gatsas responded Page 7. It really starts when the Chairman asked Mr. Sanborn to talk about the renovation. A couple of things for clarification. If you look at Page 2 it really started about the \$748,000 that was being paid to the City and that there was some confusion about that money. Mr. Sanborn stated “ That wasn’t the \$750,000 it was \$748,000 or \$749,000 and approximately another \$250,000 was owed to the building of the stage. We are also paying back the bank \$120,000. It then goes on to say we are taking care of all of that. Part of the project, Alderman, is we offered to relocate Singer Family Park. Not the stage but the soccer field basically. We have allotted construction estimates between \$500,000 and \$750,000 to do that depending on the site. We are willing to be honest with you. We don’t really care. It is your decision as to what you want to do. If you want to recreate the park or put the money towards another worthwhile cause that is totally your decision and I think that is why I was referred to this Committee.” I think that the number is between \$500,000 and \$750,000 and I guess that brings me back to an original question that if the City has already allocated \$1.1 million towards the debt that the contractor paid the City for Singer Park, the bleachers and the lights then I don’t think the bleachers should be deducted from that price because we paid for them. We own them. That shouldn’t come off the \$550,000 to \$750,000. That is our property once we paid the \$1.1 million. Those are our lights and our bleachers. There is no need to pay for them twice or deduct them twice. I guess I am looking between the number of \$500,000 and \$750,000 and at this point in time I would rather have Mr. Ludwig do the work because certainly he has done a fine job at West Memorial and he has done a fine job at Livingston so I would rather have our Parks Department take care of that venue as we allocated during the CIP budget, which 14 members voted for with the understanding that \$500,000 along with the footnote that was going to be funded from the Riverfront Park project either as a cash contribution or in lieu of cash with construction to be done by the developer. The project is in accordance with the Parks & Recreation action plan. I think it has been pretty clear when we started discussing this in March and then there is another meeting here where we talked about it again on March 18 where other Aldermen brought in their ideas. I think that the CIP budget that we voted for in June was pretty clear with the footnote. Mr. MacKenzie, can you in your time here ever recall seeing a footnote on a CIP budget that actually allocated funds outside the budget?

Mr. MacKenzie responded there have been instances where there has been other contributions other than bond toward special projects and I would just note similarly the Gatsas Athletic project at Livingston was under the Other table, and this is also the Other table. So there have been instances where private contributions have been used towards public projects.

Alderman Gatsas asked but do you ever remember that when those other projects had been footnoted that they had been changed.

Mr. MacKenzie answered no.

Alderman Gatsas asked so your understanding would be that this project would see the \$500,000 coming from the developer to go to Derryfield Park for that expansion.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes.

Chairman O'Neil asked are there any other questions about the Derryfield Master Plan. I have a few. In Phase II you talk about reconstructing the tennis courts. Do we know is there a need for tennis courts at Derryfield and would they be used because I will share with you that any time I have driven by our tennis courts around the City with the exception of Livingston I haven't seen heavy usage of them. Do you have any numbers to back up their use?

Mr. Johnson answered we have had requests for the tennis courts. They also get used by Hillside Middle School for this physical education program and I know the physical education instruction there, she works for us during the summer, and she has also asked for them. They do get used. The tennis courts I know at Livingston get used quite a bit by the public. The ones at Memorial and at West they do have postings at the court saying that their priority use is for the schools so sometimes that does deter the public from going in there. During the summer they probably get more use.

Chairman O'Neil asked but do you have any numbers to back up how often...my concern is are we building tennis courts for the sake of building tennis courts and they don't get used. I go by up there and I don't remember other than Trinity using it during their tennis season that Derryfield was heavily used.

Mr. Johnson answered I think you are right. Tennis kind of goes up and down in cycles. There used to also be a summer tennis program through our department, which we no longer have that introduced young kids to tennis but we can take a look to see if we need them.

Chairman O'Neil responded I would like to see that because it certainly would allow us to do more with a soccer type field if the tennis courts didn't go in. I am very concerned that all of that will fit up there because of the topography. I would like to see us take a look at that and not build tennis courts just for the sake of building tennis courts. We need to have some information that would justify the

use in my opinion. That is the first thing. Secondly, regarding this new access road is that improved Park Drive and parking area in Phase II? Is that the new road that would go down to Reservoir Avenue?

Mr. Johnson answered that is correct.

Chairman O'Neil stated again I am going to give my personal opinion having grown up by there. I don't see the need to bring an access road out on Reservoir Avenue. I think we are taking good park space that is used and making roadways out of it. I personally don't think that makes sense.

Mr. Johnson responded I will go back to some of the slides...what we have done in the first phase is we created a couple of series of parking lots. One is this parking lot here. What we found out was that in the past we were getting a lot of parking all on the grass fields in this area. We get a lot of use, especially in the fall when you have Pop Warner programs playing here and you have softball in this area during August. So what we did because of the need is we created this large parking lot and the idea...I think what we are looking at is mainly not looking at this road here but just trying to create this spine going across. This plan actually came about through the developer for Gill Stadium. He took our Master Plan or the work from Phase I and modified it a little bit. We were originally saying the road would go down here. They were suggesting that it go this way and I think that makes some sense. Then if we do tennis courts they could be sited up in this area. So, I think what the road would do is alleviate...this would be posted. It would be 15 MPH similar to the Livingston Park road. It also provides an exit for the cars that are parked in here to get out. We find now that because this intersection at Bridge Street is so hard to get out a lot of people go out this way by Reservoir Avenue and then exit out just beyond the Red Cross building to get out on to Mammoth Road. We are trying to find two entries and exits for the park. It would also allow people to go this way to get back down to Reservoir Avenue. This intersection is a real problem. We are going to have to do a traffic study I think in the future to determine what the best need is there. That was the rationale for that and again this came from the developer, HNTB, that took our plan and this was actually when they were looking at Singer Park.

Chairman O'Neil stated but you can access Reservoir Avenue by coming up around the first base side of the baseball field. So in fact there isn't just once entrance into it. You can make the loop around correct?

Mr. Johnson replied right but all of our parking is down here and if all of this traffic had to come out this way to get to this intersection. That is where it will back up. Right now there is a parking lot right here that Trinity uses and when there is a baseball game going on people do park in this area. One of the issues

that we have had from the Police Department is this is a public road right here. This section is a public road. This section goes private. There is no defined right-of-way through there and they get problems when there are events up here that people are parked all over and they block the traffic. They can't get through. We have tried lining the course to travel but still we do have some issues. So I think when we get to this section of the park we would like to develop some additional parking and really define that roadway and look at these improvements. That will all come out in the next plan.

Chairman O'Neil responded again I don't feel it is going to solve a lot of problems. When you have the big events, the big cross-country events or the Pop Warner football games on Sunday people are still going to park because the closest place to park to the football field is going to be on Bridge Street or the side streets up there. They are not going to go down back to park. They don't do it now and they are able to. I would ask you to take another look at that. Can we get a breakdown of these improvements? You must have some budget of what it costs to do the tennis courts and what it costs to do the drive and parking area, etc. Can we get a breakdown of that?

Mr. Johnson answered sure.

Chairman O'Neil stated I have a few other questions. Again, in the future years work is there a breakdown to back-up the \$500,000 a year request?

Mr. Johnson answered not at this point. We are estimating just over the course of the next five years and looking at the scale of the improvements and the scope of work that needs to be done. Those are estimates but once we get closer to those we will do more detailed breakdowns.

Chairman O'Neil asked so in fact it may not be \$500,000. It could be more or less?

Mr. Johnson answered correct.

Chairman O'Neil stated you spoke about the traffic signals at Bridge Street. Do we have any accident report information there or any of that?

Mr. Johnson answered we can get that. I know that one of the staff people in our office was involved in an accident last year just coming up Bridge Street where someone...if you have been to that intersection it is really hard to make a left turn especially when Trinity is in session because a lot of cars are coming in. That would all be part of the traffic study. Looking at that and coming up with

improvements. We do have an issue because it backs up pretty close to the Mammoth Road/Bridge Street Extension light so we would have to look at that.

Chairman O'Neil asked are there funds to do a traffic study at this point.

Mr. Johnson answered no. That would be part of the next plant.

Chairman O'Neil asked so Phase III.

Mr. Johnson answered yes.

Alderman Smith stated future work I notice you have the Weston Observatory. I have had several complaints...I know the trades unions and so forth went through and went from top to bottom and rehabilitated the area and I notice that I got one or two calls in the fall when people were going to go up there to look at the leaves and so forth that it was in tough shape. Is there any maintenance being performed on that?

Mr. Ludwig responded we have seasonally tried to maintain it. Again, it is subject to weather. It is a rubber roof up there. We do go in and clean it and try to do some maintenance but quite frankly the inside being subject to the weather and conditions and changing seasons is difficult and it is probably getting to the point where it needs some additional dollars spent on it or some kind of private organization that hopefully may come forward and pump some money into it as they did previously.

Alderman Shea asked what is the bottom line. In other words, what is going to happen? Is nothing going to happen? Are we dependent upon chasing down the developer to get some money? What is going to happen? In other words where does this project stand? I think that Alderman Gatsas and other people on this Committee would like to know. What is going to happen?

Mr. Ludwig answered we can't do much without the money so I guess that is why we are here although that wasn't the intent of us coming here tonight.

Alderman Shea responded I realize that. The point in coming here tonight is to present this and it is very good. Phase I is completed and Phase II is developmental so to speak and you are waiting for the funding but there is no funding so what would you want the Committee to do?

Mr. Ludwig replied again Alderman we were asked to come here and just present what the Master Plan was for Phase II and that is what we have done.

Chairman O'Neil stated that is right. Just to update the Committee and get suggestions if the Committee wanted to see other things done.

Alderman Shea stated I think that in fairness to people who are interested in this project, I mean if it were in my ward or my concern I would be very much interested in knowing how is this going to be funded and what are we going to do about it. Mr. Chairman, what would you like to do concerning this project?

Chairman O'Neil responded specifically on this presentation I wasn't looking for us to take any action unless there was some specific direction on types of things. Again, I would like some information on the tennis courts and the roadway but we can't move forward without the money.

Alderman Lopez stated two things. One, Southern NH Regional Planning Commission can do a traffic study for you. We pay them and they have done many in the City so I would check with them through Tom Lolicata. I think that this Committee, knowing a little bit about Parks & Recreation and knowing a little bit about the tennis courts up there that are in deplorable condition and the playground now and the whole thing coming to light...I think Mr. Chairman we even had in the Police Athletic League 80 students up there in the summer time doing tennis. Statistical data can bear out certain things but it depends on exactly what we are looking for. I know that 49% of the people that use Livingston swimming pool come from outside of Manchester but that is another issue that we will tackle another day. I think the most important thing since we approved the direction I am making a motion if you will accept it to pursue to get the \$500,000 from the developer to give Parks & Recreation as we so stated in the CIP.

Chairman O'Neil responded before I accept that motion, let's have some more discussion.

Alderman Lopez stated well not necessarily \$500,000. It could be a little bit more but get the necessary funds that we were promised from Singer Park to transfer over to Parks.

Chairman O'Neil stated I would ask you not to make that motion and let's get a little more discussion. The other thing I would like to point out is I am pretty sure the agreement says that they have the right to build the facility I think. I don't know if anybody...just give a nod if I am correct on that.

Alderman Gatsas asked do you want the quote from Mr. Sanborn.

Chairman O'Neil answered I am talking about what the agreement says. Let's move on.

Alderman Smith stated I would like to point out one thing in regards to this issue. I think that we should instruct Mr. Jabjiniak to write a letter to the developer and get it in writing one way or the other and then come back because I really think that we are in the middle of a see-saw up and down. It is in the CIP budget. It was never funded. They are looking for resources to do something with the park and I would just like to get an answer and I don't think there is anything wrong if we instruct Bill Jabjiniak to get in touch with the developer and find out which way he is going and end the debate.

Chairman O'Neil responded that is similar to what Alderman Lopez asked for.

Alderman Gatsas asked Mr. Johnson can you tell me...you made reference a couple of times to the developer looking at your plan. How long ago did they look at those plans?

Mr. Johnson answered it was back probably last February. We provided our Phase I drawing, which included the playground and the entry road and then they use that to overlay to look at a schematic plan for the other improvements that were shown there – the roadways and the parking.

Alderman Gatsas replied well obviously they couldn't have looked at it before March because those are the minutes I am looking at. They probably looked at it between March 11 and March 18 because that is when they came back. Now you explained to me that the plan you showed us there came from the developer with the tennis courts and the soccer field?

Mr. Johnson responded it was modified. They took our plan and what you saw there was the drawing of the playground and our existing parking lot and then I had the roadway that went down toward Hillside. That is how we were going to originally do it and then we were going to put in tennis courts. They came back and recommended that if the Singer Park facility was going to be placed there it would make more sense to bring that road with some spine parking off of it. You could have some head in parking along there and then we would put the tennis courts in approximately the same location. It just got modified a little bit and then they were going to do some additional parking right at the end of Reservoir to accommodate...they were trying to get as much parking as possible for the new facility.

Alderman Gatsas asked are you saying that the design that you showed us was a design that you and the developer worked out.

Mr. Johnson answered the developer took our plan and...

Alderman Gatsas interjected did they send that back to you.

Mr. Johnson replied well we actually took that graphic out of the report that was provided to the City from the developer.

Alderman Gatsas stated so they have been looking at this for awhile and they haven't done any construction...they could have come to us since June to say they were ready to proceed forward or no.

Mr. Ludwig responded in fairness to them at the time there was a lot of discussion going on relative to what was even going to happen. One of the things they wanted to take a look at was Derryfield because it came up as an issue. We supplied them with a plan. They tweaked our plan only in my opinion to the extent that they kind of turned that road going in between the tennis courts rather than down to Hillside, which was a part of the plan that we looked at and thought made some sense. Other than that, they really didn't do much. They did maximize the size of the existing soccer field to 360' by 225', which we would try to do also if we could because that seems to be the size that most soccer teams want to have. The larger the field, the better. They didn't do a lot to it. They took it. We also provided them at the time I can recall some price estimates that we had on different amenities and I think it was with Mr. Rob Fruniere at that time that I provided that information to in a hurried basis. It was just a conceptual thing that they were looking at and that is pretty much the way it happened.

Alderman Lopez stated just for clarification I think that this Committee at one time told them to look at the plan that you had for Derryfield. Is that correct?

Mr. Ludwig responded I believe that is true.

Alderman Gatsas stated Mr. Clougherty I believe you and I had a conversation maybe three weeks ago and I had requested from City Finance exactly this question of who owes the funds to the City and I believe you gave me an answer and what was that answer.

Mr. Clougherty responded that it was in the Memorandum of Understanding.

Alderman Gatsas asked and who did you say was responsible for paying for it.

Mr. Clougherty answered in my opinion it would be the two signatories of the MOU. I think that is Drew and Kurt. I would have to go back and look. I don't have it in front of me. This issue, Alderman, when this project started the developer came in and said we will move Singer Park and made an offer to help

the City move the park and in that regard said certainly look at moving the facility and given the minutes you quoted tonight said I will make a dollar contribution or something along those lines. He then it appears met with Parks & Recreation and had some of his people do some preliminary looks at that but nobody ever got back to him in terms of is that the design. We are seeing tonight the design. Is that what you want to consider? Either doing that or giving them money? It seems to me what you do is take the minutes that you were quoting and you take the MOU and you take this plan and you send it to him and say this is what we want done and can you get back to us in a reasonable time period that tells us what your approach would be. That would be the start of a dialogue to move this project forward. I think that is only fair to do that communication to them. It seems like they came in and looked at this but nobody got back to them and said that is what we want.

Chairman O'Neil stated I would like to bring closure to this because we have to get moving forward. There is actually a tabled item, Item 21 on the agenda, that would be appropriate for us to remove from the table and act on and that would get us heading in that direction. It says right here "getting cash or they will be providing in-kind services to build that field." I specifically remember discussing that they may build the field.

Mr. Clougherty stated if that is what the Board wants then pull together this package and get back to him.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to remove Item 21 from the table.

Communication from Ron Ludwig, Parks & Recreation, providing an update on the Riverfront Park Project and asking about the status of the "cash contribution" from the Riverfront Park Project, which was supposed to be earmarked for CIP #510004 Derryfield Park Rehabilitation Phase II. (Note: Tabled on 10/14/2003 to have the Solicitor review the agreements and talk with Mr. Jabjiniak and Mr. Ludwig to determine whether we are getting cash or they will be providing in-kind services to build that field.)

Chairman O'Neil stated we tabled this. Is it the intent of this Committee to move forward on this request?

Alderman Smith asked did we ever get a report from the Solicitor in regards to this. We asked him to review the agreement.

Chairman O'Neil answered I have never seen one.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold stated I did review the agreement as has been relayed to you tonight. The obligation is set forth in the MOU. On Page 3 it refers to it as an obligation of the stadium developer. I can read it to you. It says, "the cost of relocating and recreating the Singer Family Park facilities at another location in the City of Manchester, which alternative location will be provided by the City."

Chairman O'Neil asked can we get a copy of that tomorrow.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold answered absolutely.

Chairman O'Neil stated it would be appropriate to act on this item to get this moving forward.

Alderman Shea stated the motion that was made before by Alderman Lopez is that what you are talking about regarding going after the developer to see whether or not the money is going to be forthcoming.

Chairman O'Neil responded the money or will they be providing in-kind services to build a field.

Alderman Shea stated but we have to kind of pin them down as to how long we are going to wait for a reply.

Chairman O'Neil stated the Committee will meet next on December 9.

Alderman Shea responded then we should have an answer by December 9.

Alderman Smith asked what is the motion.

Chairman O'Neil responded to ask staff to move forward in bringing some conclusion to this issue of are we getting cash or are they providing in-kind services to relocate Singer field.

Alderman Smith asked couldn't we introduce a motion to say that we want \$500,000.

Chairman O'Neil answered I am not sure that is what the agreement says. We can request it but it may bog this whole thing down. Tom, do you know the agreement?

Deputy Solicitor Arnold responded unfortunately I handed the page to Mr. Bernier so he could make copies for you. My recollection is it says cash to relocate or reconstruct. We could certainly ask them.

Chairman O'Neil stated we could ask them for the cash but I believe the agreement that we signed says they could build the field.

Mr. Jabjiniak stated it says "the cost of relocating and recreating the Singer Family Park facilities at another location in the City of Manchester, which alternative location will be provided by the City."

Chairman O'Neil asked so the agreement says nothing about cash.

Mr. Jabjiniak answered this agreement does not.

Alderman Gatsas asked what is the date of that agreement.

Chairman O'Neil stated I think we all want to head in the same direction. We can sit here and debate what agreements people have in front of them. Why don't we direct the Solicitor's Office, Finance Office and Destination Coordinator to sit down with the developer and resolve this issue hopefully by our next meeting?

Alderman Lopez stated I just want to make sure that whoever is involved in this...I think the intent or at least my intent is the first option which is them giving us the money to relocate the field. Interpretation. I would say we would like to have the cash and then come back and tell us what he is going to do.

Mr. Jabjiniak responded can I jump in and offer a suggestion. If this is the site that you want, which is Derryfield, we will go back to him and ask him to come up with a number for relocating the facilities there, recreating a soccer field basically according to the plan that you have. At that point there is your number that is locked in. He budgeted and Alderman Gatsas read it earlier that his construction estimates are between \$500,000 and \$750,000. He can then pinpoint the number but is this the location that you want is the question.

Chairman O'Neil stated I think that is the next presentation on this subject.

Alderman Lopez stated but the point I want to make, Mr. Chairman, is you can go back and do that, forget the location. Take the cash.

Mr. Jabjiniak responded if I may the dollars might change from location to location and that is what we are trying to pin down.

Alderman Lopez stated apparently I am not making myself very clear. The first option is whatever he decides after you talk to him if he says okay they want the cash here is \$500,000 or here is \$550,000 goodbye or we will relocate the park would be the second option. I don't understand why it is so difficult to go back and say it is going to cost X number of dollars to relocate the park but we don't want it we want the cash.

Chairman O'Neil responded that is correct but they have the right based on the agreement to relocate it. We can ask for the cash.

Alderman Lopez asked is that what the City Solicitor is really saying.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold answered I think the agreement speaks for itself. It was to reconstruct or relocate. It says the cost of relocating or recreating the Singer Park facilities at another location. That is what the agreement says.

Chairman O'Neil asked does that mean cash or does that mean they can construct it.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold responded both alternatives were discussed. This agreement does not specify either one. I think that they could probably select either one because it does say the cost of relocating and recreating. That, I think, presumes a cash payment.

Chairman O'Neil replied so we can ask for cash but it appears they have the option.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold responded yes.

Alderman Gatsas stated I think it is important that we understand dates of these agreements and we understand what we are talking about because the date of the MOU is November 2002. With that in mind, when we were talking about relocating Singer Family Park in November and December when this agreement first came before us we were talking about relocating the entire venue – the lights, the stage, the soccer field so for them to stand by the MOU they are going to have to produce the stage, the lights and the soccer field, which is going to be far in excess of what we are talking about doing at Derryfield.

Chairman O'Neil replied I don't know that that is necessarily true.

Alderman Gatsas stated I think if you read the MOU...

Chairman O'Neil interjected we are not going to debate the MOU in this Committee tonight. We are going to hear from the department on recommendations for the relocation of the facility. They have looked at other sites. It may be that the recommendation is Derryfield Park but we are going to hear from them on it. We are going to hear input from the Planning Department regarding the relocation and I think we can send the request and ask our staff to start meeting and communicating with the developers regarding this issue but I can tell you what they are going to come back and say. Unless you folks have determined where it is going to be we can't come up with a number.

Alderman Gatsas responded with all due respect I think this Board of 14 Aldermen have already made that decision. They made it during the budget process. They put the CIP budget together. The included in there a footnote as Mr. MacKenzie said that never before has it ever been changed. I don't know why we are looking at new sites because the full Board already decided the site. That decision was made when we did the CIP budget in June. I don't know why we are out looking at new sites.

Chairman O'Neil replied no what we did in June was commit to doing work at Derryfield Park. It didn't mean that it was going to be Singer Park relocated.

Alderman Gatsas responded here is the footnote on the CIP budget.

Chairman O'Neil stated we are going to bring closure to this. What is the intent of the Committee? Before we accept any motions do you want to hear from the staff on other possible sites?

Alderman Smith asked are there any other possible sites, Ron.

Chairman O'Neil stated they are ready to make a presentation on that.

Mr. Ludwig stated I don't think we looked necessarily at other sites to move on as it relates to not going to Derryfield or other. I think there has been an interest in this Committee overall to say to us to some degree find us some other opportunities for rectangular fields as some of our venues expand. We may not have one good choice on here that anyone is really interested in particularly is what I mean by that. We are a growing City. We are going to see lacrosse come down the road as far as other sports there is no doubt about that. You could look at this five minute presentation and again I want to reemphasize that we didn't put this together to cause controversy in a softball league because we talk a little bit about Wolfe or St. Anthony's Field because I think that is in our presentation. We use the end of Douglas Street and a little bit of...

Chairman O'Neil interjected let's have you make the presentation and then this Committee can take a vote on what they want to do. Make the presentation.

Mr. Johnson stated as mentioned what we were charged to look at was...this is the existing Singer Park. This field is 225' across and 360' long. It is a maximum size field and that is why it was so well liked throughout the City. It is really almost Olympic sized. It is the largest venue you can have for a rectangular field. So with that being said we don't have a lot of area in our parks existing that have level areas so we looked at several different sites. The five different sites as Ron mentioned were Derryfield, Wolfe Park, Stark Park, St. Anthony's and Piscataquog. Again, it was for that large field. We also wanted to make sure that there was adequate parking because you can't put a facility this size unless there is going to be room for adequate parking and also we wanted to minimize or look at neighborhood impact. The first one we did look at was Derryfield Park. These slides were taken from the City aerial and are a little older. These were the existing four tennis courts that were located at the park. Just to orient you, this is Bridge Street, the main entrance. Trinity High School is right over here. This is the Al Lemire field. What we did is we took the footprint of a 225' x 360' field and placed it. This would be right on top of the existing lower Derryfield field. What we did was we assessed each site with pros and cons. We understand that it needs a little bit more review. We would have to work with Planning and Traffic and Highway to really resolve all of these but some of the pros...this site does have adequate space to accommodate that field. We have that level area. There is existing parking. We have our new parking lot here and then the other parking that was proposed in the plan. There is room for parking up in this area. It would not require a wetlands permit. It is dry land. The cons were traffic congestion. There is the issue of the traffic problem on Bridge Street and one of the other cons is there is no net gain of a field. We are essentially overlaying this new field on top of an existing field. That is Derryfield. Wolfe Park we looked at. Just to orient you this is Second Street here and this is South Main and Harvell coming through. This is the north side of the park where we have the existing men's softball field. I showed this to Bob MacKenzie earlier and he did mention that we have a new housing development right here that is going up. There are some new condominiums. The pros for this are there is adequate space. We can fit the field in there. There is room for parking. We could do some parking over in this area. We do have an existing lot there. It is accessible. You can get to it from these main arterial streets. The cons again are traffic congestion. The Harvell/Second Street is a real difficult intersection. Again, we lose a softball field that would be put out of service and we would have to find a new site for the men's softball league and we would also have to do a wetlands permit for this project. There is a wet area here. This whole area behind Carisbrooke is a wetland and it does continue...it drains down in this area so we would have to do some permitting for that. The next site we looked at was Stark Park, the lower portion of Stark Park.

North River Road is up in this area. This is Park Avenue coming here and this is Victoria Street and this is the B&M railroad in this area. There is an existing small field down in this area and we did look and it would fit in that area. That is one of the pros that the field would fit in there but this park has several issues. There would be a traffic impact to this neighborhood. There is limited space to develop parking. There is real difficult access. When you come down here it is a steep grade to get down into this lower level. We would have to remove quite a few trees and we also have a wet area in here and would have to do a wetlands permit. Those are the pros and cons at Stark Park. We took a look at St. Anthony's Park. We do have a large open space there. This is Taylor Street and Laxson Avenue, which leads out to South Willow Street. It is located not too far off of Jewett Street if you are not familiar with that particular park. Right now it has two softball fields and they overlay in the center with the soccer field. There is adequate space. You could fit the field in there. Again, as you can see with all of the residential development around there there would be traffic impacts to the neighborhood. There is limited space to develop any parking and we would lose a softball field by putting this in so we don't have any net gain of a field. We could also take some additional land up here if we needed to develop parking but then again we would lose some more recreational space so it is a little tight.

Chairman O'Neil asked can you go back to St. Anthony's for a second. Theoretically could you turn it 90 degrees?

Mr. Johnson answered we could but then it would impact the two fields. You could turn it this way and then get some of the parking in the back. It could work there.

Mr. Ludwig stated if I can just add to that the lower field is actually a hard ball field. Even though it looks like a fully skinned infield, which it is, Memorial does use that for boy's baseball.

Mr. Johnson stated the last site we looked at was the Piscataquog River Park. Just to orient you, this is the West Junior Deb complex and the West Side ice arena and then this is the abandoned railroad corridor where we are developing the rail trail project. This is Douglas Street and right at the very end there is an open area that has...we looked at it when we did some master planning work for this property and said that it would be a nice site to develop for a park. The field could fit in there although it would require a lot of grading. This is a real steep grade. We would have to do some retaining wall so the pros are there is no existing field here so you do gain a new field. It is near these other fields so it would be a nice overall recreational complex. People could access it along the railroad corridor. The cons would be the site work and also the traffic impact. It is hard to get to this. You would have to come through a network of streets off of Douglas Street.

You could come down Cumberland to get in there but it is real difficult to get to and there is limited space to develop. We could develop some parking here and they could use some parking that is actually right over in this area behind the West Side ice arena. Those were the five parks that we looked at to see if we could try to find space for Singer Family Park. Again, those were kind of conceptual and a real quick view of what we have out there without the City buying additional land or taking other City property to put the field in.

Alderman Shea asked what do you think the best site might be.

Mr. Ludwig answered given the information that we presently have and the fact that we have a plan in place that goes forward with Derryfield it is probably the most appropriate site at this point because we know the pluses and the minuses and so on and so forth. We maintain to keep the two softball fields in existence on top of the soccer field or the soccer field over the two softball fields. In our opinion I think right now to move forward Derryfield is probably better but again we wanted to bring to the attention of this Committee and others that there are some other sites out there that are available for future City development of whatever we want to do. We would be happy to look into those more closely if the Committee would like us to do that.

Alderman Shea asked what would you consider the most appropriate site for relocating Singer Park.

Mr. Ludwig answered again I don't think our charge was Singer Park the venue. We were looking for a rectangular field and that is what we tried to focus on. I missed that point a little bit last time I think at the last meeting and we tried to refocus our direction in terms of relocating a park. We would probably stick with Derryfield at this point.

Chairman O'Neil asked Ron am I correct that most of the parks we are looking at multiple use kind of thing like combining softball in the spring time with them and that so they won't be truly available for soccer in the spring and fall.

Mr. Ludwig answered not in all cases, no.

Alderman Lopez stated I don't have a particular question other than there has been a motion to instruct staff to first of all go back because the minutes that had been quoted and what has been written afterwards I am surprised at but anyway I would like to move to have staff go back to relocate the park but the first order of business is how much cash are they going to give us if we don't want the park relocated. If it is a legal interpretation that they will relocate the park and we have

no other options then I would say relocate the soccer field at Derryfield. The first option is to try to get cash.

Chairman O'Neil asked cash so that we can build at Derryfield for instance. Is that your recommendation?

Alderman Lopez answered so that Parks & Recreation can do the job.

Chairman O'Neil asked is there a second to that motion.

Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Forest stated I have a comment. I may be wrong but I understand and at least recall that several months ago the Mayor along with this Board I wouldn't say promised but we made a comment to the Singer family that we would do our best to relocate the soccer field somewhere in the City and that is the comment I want to make. I respect Alderman Lopez's request for cash but I think the Mayor's comments and with our vote we sort of promised the Singer family that this soccer field would be relocated somewhere and I think we should stick with that commitment.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Mr. Ludwig asked would you still like us to report back on tennis court usage.

Chairman O'Neil answered yes that is for me.

Mr. Ludwig stated I just want to get this straight. You also want the cost breakdown of future improvements and a traffic study, which Alderman Lopez feels that Southern NH Regional Planning could help us with. Is that pretty much it?

Chairman O'Neil responded there is just one other question I missed. Is there a balance in Phase I right now.

Mr. Johnson answered no it has all been expended.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Update on Derryfield Country Club Clubhouse project.

Chairman O'Neil stated let me open up with I was a little shocked to learn through a call from a reporter that there were some concerns about Derryfield. I would just like to voice that there are going to be problems on construction projects but the Board should have been informed about it. We have had issues...we had a similar issue with the building of the new fire station and the Board got involved and we got those costs under control and were able to build the fire station. So, I just would ask in the future that you keep the Board involved and informed as to what is going on. I was surprised to hear that...

Mr. Ludwig interjected if I could just respond with all due respect I was going...although it wasn't a matter of record this Committee would have known before it hit the paper but that meeting was postponed so I never really thought to even come in and do that.

Chairman O'Neil responded but you could have just sent a one-page letter saying I need to appear before the Board because we have some problems with issues that we need to work out.

Mr. Ludwig replied understood.

Chairman O'Neil stated I would just ask that going forward so that we can help resolve those issues. With that, please proceed.

Mr. Ludwig stated aside from what we have already read in the paper and tried to set some of the record straight, I provided Committee members with pretty much what I thought would be somewhat helpful which was a chronological analysis of the Derryfield Country Club project. As you know, our Master Plan back in 1968 done by Orcott Associates identified our present building in very poor condition and probably cost prohibitive to make repairs to. We still feel the same way although if that is what happens I guess that is what we would have to do. We have issues there relative to the roof at the present time, relative to fire suppression to electrical concerns and I don't think I have to tell the Chairman that those are concerns. He has seen them himself on previous tours with Mayor Baines. That is probably as good an eye as you can have towards the project. To go quickly through what we have done here is on March 15 we actually updated a review and analysis of conceptual construction cost estimates provided by some local architectural firms. In other words we were out there trying to justify a range that we could effectively put a new facility up on the site. We went with a range of \$1.9 million to \$2.3 million at the time. At this time I will tell you that I think that was probably low but that is what we went with. Some of that I think you have to realize is based on...there are a couple of players here. The present tenant that we are dealing with has a 19 year lease at the current time and basically we are being instructed to work with him in trying to provide a new building so there is give

and take as to what is even affordable. Had we come in and asked for \$3 million or larger, that didn't really fit into the program in terms of the debt expense being paid back. So the long and the short of it is we would try to make the number...maybe we were trying to put 20 pounds of sausage in a 10 pound bag here but that is what we were trying to do to get out from under what was pretty much a deplorable building. We did proceed in December and we worked together diligently to try to come up with a management agreement between the City and DLL Restaurant, Inc. delineating the terms, the building construction, occupation and payment schedule. In January as instructed by this Board we put together a selection committee to provide and interview architectural engineering services. I won't read all of the names but you can see the names that were involved there. It was kind of a cross section of different City individuals from Planning, Public Building Services and others. We did an RFQ for architectural services and on April 10 the architectural firm of Dennis Mires was selected to perform the design engineering work for the clubhouse. On April 15 the bond resolution for the \$2.3 million was approved by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen. Moving forward on May 7 Eckman Construction with Dennis Mires on our team was selected as the construction manager through an RFQ process. We were also instructed to entertain a couple of meetings with the general public, one with the membership as an informational meeting. We did that on May 14. Don't hold me to that date. I may be off a week but we also conducted subsequent to that an abutter informational meeting and that was really for the placement of our new maintenance building. In June the contract for construction of the new maintenance building was executed with Eckman, which I am happy to report is in place. It did take a little bit of work and it cost us a little bit more given that we had to construct a drive in by the fire station because the neighbors did not want us coming in by Burgess Street.

Chairman O'Neil asked do we know out of the bond that has been approved what the cost of that building is to date.

Mr. Ludwig answered the maintenance building as now run us about \$330,000. It is complete and we are in there and I am happy...

Chairman O'Neil interjected that is for everything – design and everything is paid.

Mr. Ludwig responded yes that is done and we have received a Certificate of Occupancy. We are in there so in terms of relieving ourselves from a hazardous situation in our building, we are done.

Chairman O'Neil stated that is a big step.

Mr. Ludwig answered exactly. Aside from I am happy to say that the guys on the golf course really appreciate the fact that they are finally working under some conditions like they have never seen before. I am here to say thanks to you guys for putting them in that position. It is going to cut down on our injuries and enough said about that. However, moving forward on July 18 construction of the new maintenance began. I will move down and say that back on August and we had a timeline that ended somewhere...was supposed to end somewhere in July is where we were starting to get a feel that this project was coming in over budget. However, when I started questioning the architect and the construction manager who was starting to put us on notice that it appeared we were getting a little out of line here it seemed like we were at a point where hard lines were being drawn on the paper and to go back to redraw those hard lines was going to cost us additional funds so we were kind of between a rock and a hard place. We said we will move forward with the existing design and let the construction manager shop the job around, which he completed some time toward the end of September I believe and it came in exactly how we thought – extremely high over budget almost to the tune of \$3.7 million when we had \$2.3 million. Since that time we had gone back to the architect and the construction manager and asked them to work on our behalf to try to get the number down. We now have the number down to about \$3.2 million but we have pretty much stripped the building. We have realigned the building. We have taken out many of the amenities that were in the first building, the first design and we are now pretty much at bare bones. We are still looking at trying to remove some additional dollars but it has become evident that we are probably not going to reach the budgeted number that is in place now. I included for you as part of this package Section 21 of the management agreement that kind of spells out how the \$2.2 million I believe it refers to, not \$2.3 million but I think the Resolution was \$2.3 million, how we move forward with the expenditure of the so-called vanilla box improvements and what we do and the second page of that pretty much explains what the options are in terms of going back to the drawing board. Just to let you know where we are now in another two weeks we should have some additional redesign, however, I am not too confident that that is going to get us where we need to be as it relates to this budget. Some of the problems here are that even if we have the money we are not sure at this point in time that either the present tenant and/or the Enterprise, which is funding basically the majority of this project is going to be capable of taking on that kind of debt expense and it is something that we would have to go back and look at Finance if it was the desire of this Board for us to move forward. We would have to take a very close look at that. We are not just here to say that we are over budget but that we have problems in terms of being able to get the building constructed. I just want to add and I know you want to speak with Dennis Mires because he is here and has been here for a couple of hours and I appreciate his time but you are more than welcome to ask him about some of the issues that we did run into in terms of trying to maximize the size of the building on the lot because we do understand

that we have golfers. That is our first priority. Our second priority is going to be the tenant's ability to do business and have weddings at the same time on Saturdays. In an effort to try to maximize the parking facilities, which we already know are going to be a stretch, we tried to push the building in an easterly direction, which pushed us into some unsuitable material that was accepted many years ago from the Elliot Hospital. Good material, not hazardous material, but not compacted in the right way. So we had some over excavation as it relates to the positioning of the building to maximize the parking in addition with some site work that we really didn't plan on. The site work came in about double to try to increase the parking as much as we could to accommodate the overall program. So that was our problem. We had a management agreement with a program that we can't really match to at this point with the numbers in place. Before I open it up to the rest of the Committee members for questions I just want to say that there are a couple of ways that we could move forward. One would be to continue for the next couple of weeks at least and we would like to be in the ground as much as anybody else but we can't authorize it obviously because we are not there. We could continue to do some value engineering but only to the extent where we feel that we are at a point where we feel it is jeopardizing the construction of the building and it is not the quality type of building that we want to have nor is it the proper size. The management agreement does speak to, which we haven't exercised yet, a depletion notice, which simply means that if I put the tenant on notice we have 30 days to basically put our heads together either back to the Aldermen or over to Finance and say what can we do to bring the project in and make it doable. That just puts a timeline on us. If at the end of that 30 days we don't have anything we can pretty much walk away from the table or we can go back to the management agreement, I guess, and try to renegotiate it with a smaller program in terms of the size of the facility. One of the big things that is driving it in terms of and I don't want to speak for the tenant but the fact that we need a 200 seat banquet facility. That seems to be key in terms of running tournaments, having weddings and that is a number I guess that is out there in the industry that you really have to have with sufficient space to be able to accommodate the bride, the wedding party and whatever. The center part of the building we may be able to get down a little bit in terms of the square footage, which is basically the lobby area, the kitchen area and again when I speak it is two levels. The third area that we could take a look at again but that would probably affect the tenants program and ability to pay off the 69% of the debt expense that he has basically committed to in the management agreement we may have to go back and work with Finance to see if there are any ways we could relax that effort just to bring the program into line as it relates to the size of the building. Those are some options that we have and with that being said I will turn it back over to you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman O'Neil stated I just want to make sure I am clear. We approved a bond of \$2.3 million. So there is approximately \$2 million left to do the building as you have already paid \$300,000 or \$330,000 to relocate the maintenance facility.

Mr. Ludwig responded no. The maintenance building was some money that we had in Enterprise aside from that.

Chairman O'Neil asked so the maintenance building was not part of the bond issue.

Mr. Ludwig answered not it is not.

Chairman O'Neil asked when the construction manager priced out the job and it came in at \$3.7 million you went back and value engineered it and it is down to \$3.2 million correct.

Mr. Ludwig answered correct.

Chairman O'Neil asked so we are \$900,000 off.

Mr. Ludwig answered that is right.

Chairman O'Neil asked do you happen to know and maybe this is a question for the Finance Officer but of the original \$2.3 million the restaurant folks were paying a fairly substantial part of that.

Mr. Ludwig answered 69%.

Chairman O'Neil asked they were paying 69% of the \$2.3 million.

Mr. Ludwig answered that is right.

Alderman Lopez stated I think we are at a dead end here because A and B are already being done and C is the next item, which I don't think is going to be done but what about the owners. Do you want to comment on anything?

Mr. Mike Lanoie stated since we got the last estimate in I did meet with the architect to take a look at reducing the size of the center core of the building. We cut out between 8 and 10 feet of the length of the building or the width of the building on both floors so there should be some savings there. I think what struck us or what hurt us a lot on the estimate on this was the site work came in a lot higher than we anticipated and the original bid on the mechanicals was very high and we are revisiting those now or the architect is so hopefully there could be

some savings there. I talked to Mr. Ludwig about taking a look at the management agreement and how we could accomplish something here that would work for both us and the City. The original agreement had called for a 25 year lease on a 20 year bond payment and I suggested that maybe we could take a look at tying in the amortization of the bond to 25 years, which would allow us to borrow a few hundred thousand more dollars at the same payment. I would just like to go through and at least bid this out with the changes before we go much further. I would like to see a hard number on the value engineering.

Alderman Lopez responded I think that is good and I think Ron has indicated that for the next couple of weeks you will be working on things but the architect is here too and I know that he is the same architect for the senior center that is 15,000 square feet and I believe this is 20,000 square feet. Is that correct?

Mr. Lanoie stated it is 20,000 now but I think Dennis has cut out about 1,000 of that since our last meeting. He just told us tonight that he had reworked it and it looks like that could be done.

Mr. Ludwig stated the numbers are reflecting right now that we are dealing with 20,000 square feet.

Alderman Lopez asked can I have the architect come up to the microphone please. Could you compare the 15,000 square foot senior center, which is costing us \$3.2 million and this that is going to cost \$3.2 million for 20,000 square feet? Do you think they could get down to \$2.3 million? What are they going to have?

Mr. Dennis Mires responded they are not going to have 20,000 square feet.

Alderman Lopez asked what do you think they are going to have.

Mr. Mires answered a lot less. Essentially we looked very hard at how we can accomplish their program, which has been set at 20,000 square feet for the least possible cost. That is how we got to this \$3.2 million number. The \$3.2 million number is an overall project cost. The construction portion of that represents approximately \$2.8 to \$2.9 million. If you convert that to square footage, we are roughly \$140/square foot. \$15 to \$20 of that is site work, which gives us a building cost of approximately \$125/square foot, which is right in line with what we are seeing in the market today. As you have read, lumber has increased and mechanical costs have increased in the last year pretty substantially but I don't see getting 20,000 square feet for less than \$125/square foot for a building, particularly a public building that will get the kind of use that we anticipate both by golfers and restaurant patrons. If you look at the senior center just by way of comparison, that construction cost to finish the whole building is about \$2.6

million and that is 15,000 square feet. They are very similar in that they are two floors and there is a walk out on the lower side and there was substantial site work on the senior center as well as the Derryfield. The one difference is that there is some brick veneer at the senior center, which is not the case at Derryfield but we are building under this value-engineering scheme the Derryfield Country Club project at significantly less per square foot than the senior center. I don't see us getting this program for the \$2.3 million. We either have to cut substantial square footage and if you take \$140/square foot and try to get \$900,000 or \$800,000 out of it, it is pretty substantial square footage and in that case the restaurant program may not support the debt, which is why we are here.

Chairman O'Neil asked Dennis could you just do the math for me here. What is cost for total construction on the senior center?

Mr. Mires answered the total construction cost per square foot was about \$165 to \$170.

Chairman O'Neil asked and how much of that is attributed to site work. That same \$15 to \$20 per square foot?

Mr. Mires answered I don't have that in front of me. It is in that ballpark.

Alderman Shea stated in lieu of the fact that no final answer will be given tonight and they have presented us with as much facts as they can at this stage I think it makes sense for them to have an extension to go back and see if there is some way they can renegotiate some sort of a bond issue or to do something that would, in fact, allow this project to go through. We could ask a lot more questions but I am assuming that the bottom line is how much money can they put into it and how much money can the City put into it. There can be some sort of an agreement that way. I would think that would make sense.

Chairman O'Neil stated I have some concerns. Number one, I agree that we need to do some more work or this project is not moving forward. I am very concerned about the timeline now and I am not sure that starting this project in this springtime is in the best interest of that facility. With that said, there is going to be an additional cost to that if we delay construction until next fall. I think those options need to be presented to us. I think we all hoped that it would begin this fall and be completed in May or June of next year. I know we got involved a little bit with...this Board was pretty good at doing some value engineering on the fire station. We saw a hose tower if memory serves me right for \$200,000 and the Fire Department doesn't use hose towers anymore. We had a radiant heated floor in the apparatus bay. That was cut out and that project got in and met the financial guidelines and we have a pretty nice fire station that is going to be manned very

shortly. I would like to see when you come back in that you come back with some breakdowns that we can look at from the City side. I would like to know is the cost solely attributed to the tenant side or are there City costs that could be looked at. I would just caution that today I am not very much interested in approving anymore money from the City side for this project and I wouldn't look to raise fees on the golfers to help pay for that either. That message was pretty clear from them. We have some work to do but this is way off. In my experience with the City I have never seen a project this far off.

Alderman Gatsas stated I have a question for the architect. I guess I am a little confused on how the senior center is at \$170/square foot and a restaurant/banquet facility where I assume you are going to have two kitchens...

Mr. Mires interjected one center kitchen that would handle both the restaurant and the function facility.

Alderman Gatsas stated I guess my confusion is \$170/square foot versus \$125/square foot and that is about \$45/square foot.

Mr. Mires responded that is not the exact comparison. The \$165 to \$170 we mentioned for the senior center includes the site work, which compares to the \$140 to \$145 at the Country Club.

Alderman Gatsas stated so let's say it is \$170 including the site work and \$140 at the Derryfield, that is still \$30/square foot higher at the senior center. I am lost.

Mr. Mires answered the senior center has a major kitchen as you recall as well. The senior center is less square footage so the rate for square footage tends to creep up a little bit and it has some brick veneer that we don't have at Derryfield.

Alderman Gatsas asked is there any way, Ron, that the site work could be done by a City department or is that impossible.

Mr. Ludwig answered I don't want to commit another department to another job but some of the work in terms of the paving, which ultimately we found out that we would save a few dollars Alderman Gatsas by having Highway come in at the Derryfield Park project for instance and save some money but effectively we have looked at the parking lot at Derryfield and we have to do some excavation of material there just given the sink holes that have appeared in the lot over the years that we continue to fill in so we have to go down a little bit and get some of that material out of there to do that parking lot right and we have tried to maximize both to the north and the south where the existing building is the number of available parking spaces because we know that the impact is going to be

tremendous for 200 seats on a Saturday morning when we have golfers already in place since 6 AM.

Alderman Gatsas stated I am sure the architect has looked at...have you looked at possibly positioning that building facing down the hill, down the slope instead of it facing the tee. Do you understand what I am saying? Lining it perpendicular to where the building is now but at the far end of the parking lot where you could do your construction at this time of the year and you would really have...the second level would be at ground level.

Mr. Ludwig responded I think that is what we are doing.

Alderman Gatsas asked you have it facing down the hill.

Mr. Ludwig answered yes. If you come into the parking lot at the present level, Alderman Gatsas, you are about three feet below. You go up three steps and you are into the building. The bottom level comes out...I call it a walk out basement style going east. It is the east elevation. Just because the way the topography is right now we are trying to keep and follow that topography. It looks like a one-story building basically and Dennis is going to show you the map from the west elevation.

Mr. Mires brought the map forward. The building is parallel with Mammoth Road but at the back end of the parking lot. It is a walk-in from the parking lot, handicapped accessible with a walk out on the lower level up to the tee and out to the course. The dining facility looks across the golf course. It can be constructed while this building remains in operation and our parking lot is expanded into the area of the existing building and maximized across the Mammoth Road access.

Alderman Gatsas asked Kevin if we took it out on a 25-year amortization instead of 20 what does that do for the numbers.

Mr. Clougherty answered we didn't include it in the bond issue we just did so we can run some new numbers. The rates we just got this week were about 4.2%. If we ran it out a little bit longer you might be able to accommodate a few hundred thousand dollars as Mike said but again without committing to that I would like to have them do the value engineering and get back to us with a firmer number and then we will run some numbers for you for your next meeting perhaps or your next couple of meetings and then we can reassess where you are.

Alderman Gatsas asked when is your next bond issuance.

Mr. Clougherty answered maybe in the next couple of years. We do them every couple of years but what happens is there is something in the interim. There are opportunities to go through the Bond Bank and there are opportunities there. We just didn't want to issue it and have it sitting there and not spend it and have a problem reallocating.

Alderman Gatsas responded there is never a problem around here reallocating.

Alderman Smith asked have you evaluated all costs and have you gone and itemized where you can save a few dollars because if we do get this potential bonding we are talking \$400,000 or \$500,000. Have you done an itemized checklist and talked with different tradespeople and so forth to try and get those costs down?

Mr. Mires answered many times. We know we are over the allocated budget and we have been working hard to get the number as low as we can and and retain the programs. As you heard Mike suggest we are looking at cutting square footage out of the program to get the numbers even lower. So the process continues but we don't see accomplishing the program for the \$2.3 million as it sits.

Alderman Smith stated I have a concern. The longer we wait I would hate to impede on the golfers with construction up there if we started in May, June or July. I think time is of the essence and I was hoping that you could go back and do a little bit more homework and then we could probably talk with Mr. Clougherty and then maybe have a resolution in a couple of weeks.

Chairman O'Neil asked what is the estimated construction timeframe in weeks or months. Is the construction manager here?

Mr. Mires answered I believe we are projecting about nine months of construction.

Chairman O'Neil stated I think you are going to have to take a look at what impact it will have if we delay this until the fall. That is my personal opinion. I am very concerned about doing a project in the middle of the summer there but there may be a cost to that and we may have to make that decision. I would suggest Dennis that you and the construction manager take a look at that. Is there a cost?

Mr. Mires responded there is the impact of golfers cost and there is also a winter conditions cost on the other cycle.

Chairman O'Neil replied but if we might be ready to go in the ground in September or October that may be the ideal time to do it. The plans would be all

ready to go and we could start construction then. That might be the ideal timeframe.

Mr. Mires responded we could identify those.

Chairman O'Neil asked can we get a breakdown, at least for me, I would like to see what was pulled out of the \$3.7 million to get it to \$3.2 million and then whatever else you do I would like to see. That was helpful to us when we worked through the fire station issue.

Mr. Ludwig answered I provided a sheet with three columns that kind of identified the construction costs and we also have the sheet that Dennis has provided of what has been pulled out...I think exactly what you have asked for between \$3.7 million and \$3.2 million. We have a sheet that identifies those items.

Chairman O'Neil asked Ron does it breakdown by what is pulled out from the City side and what is pulled out from the tenant side.

Mr. Ludwig answered this sheet kind of does that but the last value engineer sheet we got from Dennis only identifies item by item by item and yes it does address City side like reducing the carpentry work in the Parks Office for instance by 50% but it doesn't give a specific number. If that is something you are looking for I would have to ask Dennis to try to attach a number to that.

Alderman Lopez asked for clarification we have a construction manager you said that we are paying.

Mr. Ludwig answered yes.

Alderman Lopez asked we are paying him now.

Mr. Ludwig answered we owe him money. He can't work for free.

Alderman Lopez stated I realize that but I think maybe Mr. Chairman we should take Mr. Ludwig's recommendation and let them all go back, the Solicitor, Finance Officer and Parks and try to get this because there is a depletion notice of 30 days. How long are we going to keep this construction manager and how long are we going to pay him? We need to have those answers. I would like to have them go back and then the City Solicitor can educate us on the depletion notice and move from there. I don't think we can hold this project forever paying people.

Chairman O'Neil responded I think that needs to be worked out. I think we need to meet our obligations in paying the architect and the construction manager. If

we owe them money we owe them money but if for some reason there are going to be delays in this that has to be presented. We are not going to pay people while a project sits on hold either.

Mr. Ludwig asked is there a specific time that you would like us to come back.

Chairman O'Neil answered we are tentatively scheduled to meet on December 9. That doesn't give you a lot of time with the holiday this week but I will ask Mr. Mires if that is reasonable to come back with something or are we pushing it with that date?

Mr. Mires responded it is aggressive. We can come back with something but it won't be a bid out price.

Mr. Ludwig stated again I think that Kevin Clougherty has said that we could meet with them as well to see if there is any creative financing relative to the term that we could come back with too.

Chairman O'Neil replied I think an update and if we need to call another meeting during the month of December then we call another meeting. We have to keep this moving and the Board has to be kept informed of what is going on. We will see what happens on December 9 but I would suggest that you be prepared to come back on December 9 and update us on where you are. Maybe you will have taken steps forward or you may have taken steps backward. Who knows?

Alderman Gatsas stated I know it has been awhile since you have been in the construction field, Mr. Lanoie, but it just amazes me...I look at this number and it is 60% above the project price. Is there something that came in that was so far out of whack from when we first looked at this project? I agree with the Chairman. If somebody would have come in and said we were off 10% or 15% I would say okay maybe the construction time is such that everybody is bidding everything up but 60% seems like an incredible figure.

Mr. Lanoie responded I think there were a few items, Alderman Gatsas, probably the site work. We had no way of really knowing what the site work would cost and it came out to about \$200,000 and the original bid came in close to over \$500,000 when you consider \$62,000 for demolition of the building. Also on the site work we had to regrade everything in the parking lot.

Mr. Ludwig stated again we got that number down a little bit since that time but part of it was as I said in my opening remarks that we were trying to locate the building almost completely off the existing parking lot and kept pushing it in an easterly direction to try and maximize every inch of parking we could. Because of

that when some of the soil testing results came back and said and I know because I was around at the time that some of that area had fill when we took fill from the Elliot Hospital when they did a project and I forget how many years ago that was and obviously it wasn't compacted properly so there was some unsuitable soil. Not hazardous but unsuitable so it would have to be removed. Again we have taken out...as a member of the Planning Board we don't advocate asphalt curbs in the City of Manchester but we have taken out wherever we could and put in granite curb and we have gone to no curb in some areas. That is a very expensive item that we tried to get down. I think we got it down to around \$300,000 now but that is how we got from \$3.7 million to \$3.2 million.

Alderman Gatsas replied right but my point is that even if you said that the site work you had in your budget \$250,000 and the bid came in at \$600,000 that is \$350,000 and that still leaves us about \$1.1 million.

Mr. Ludwig responded we had some other issues related to...I think Mike already spoke relative to mechanical, which included plumbing at a very high number. Higher than we anticipated and I really can't speak to why that system came forward so expensive. I am not an HVAC plumbing expert but it was like \$40/square foot and we were told it was supposed to be around \$20.

Alderman Gatsas asked is it impossible to go out and rebid this thing.

Mr. Mires answered no but it is not going to come down substantially. Not to \$2.3 million. \$2.3 million is underfunded in our opinion. If you take the site work out you are down to \$1 million+ and you are building this building for \$65 or \$70 a square foot, which isn't going to happen.

Alderman Gatsas asked why didn't someone make us aware of that when we first started this project.

Mr. Ludwig answered maybe in my opening remarks I should have been...I think what Dennis is saying is exactly true. I mean the City used during the very...early on in the process we had a bunch of different scenarios that were related to where do we build the building and where do we put the maintenance building and we used the person that we have on retainage as an architect who came in with higher numbers at that point. Again, it kind of goes back to if we were talking about doing this project for \$3.5 million we probably never would have developed a management agreement because it wasn't going to be an affordable project between the tenant, the Enterprise and a little bit of general fund money. We probably would have never moved forward so maybe it was pie in the sky that we were going to build it for \$2.3 million.

Chairman O'Neil stated I agree with Alderman Gatsas. We have missed by \$50,000 on some projects but never by \$900,000 or \$1 million. Something happened wrong somewhere and I would love to find out where so we don't make that mistake again. Is there a motion to put this on the table and report back at the December 9 meeting?

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Smith it was voted to table this item.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 6 of the agenda:

Resolution and budget authorization authorizing transfer and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$499,099 (Federal) for CIP 410003 GTEAP & EPOP (Domestic Violence Funding).

On motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted to approve the resolution and budget authorization.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 7 of the agenda:

Resolution and budget authorization authorizing transfer and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$40,000 (Other) for CIP 511603 Recreation Facility Improvements (Leveraged) Project.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Smith, it was voted to approve the resolution and budget authorization.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 8 of the agenda:

Resolution and budget authorization authorizing acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$110,000 (Other) for CIP 811103 Senior Center Planning Project."

On motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted to approve the resolution and budget authorization.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 11 of the agenda:

Resolution and budget authorizations authorizing transfer and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$60,000 (CDBG) for CIP 510604 Neighborhood Playground Rehabilitation Project.

Alderman Smith asked could we have a presentation by Robert MacKenzie.

Mr. MacKenzie answered perhaps we could have Ron Johnson answer this one.

Mr. Johnson stated this is the current project that we have at Sheridan Emmett Park. It is the Phase II. If you recall last year we completed work between Beech Street and Union where we recreated a new soccer field. This is on the opposite side between Union and Pine where we are looking to reconstruct the playground and do similar site improvements around the perimeter of the park with new fencing, curbing and then some work at the community garden. We did have an appropriation through the CDBG program to do some of the work and this request would allow us to complete all of the proposed improvements for a new playground and also the accessibility improvements for sidewalk, curb cuts and what not.

Alderman Smith asked so in other words you are asking for funds...Mr. MacKenzie, ADA funds to supplement.

Mr. Johnson answered that is correct. We are looking at both the CDBG program and I believe Sam Maranto was also looking at the ADA funds for sidewalk improvements and playground accessibility.

Alderman Smith asked Sam or Bob do you have a problem with using ADA funds to supplement the Sheridan Park rehabilitation.

Mr. Maranto answered actually last Friday at the Access Manchester meeting we had a vote to recommend \$40,000 be utilized to make the playground accessible and for sidewalks. Also the Planning Department suggested that we utilize balances from these projects. They are older projects.

Chairman O'Neil asked what is that total amount though. The request here is for \$60,000.

Mr. Maranto answered the total request is for \$100,000. \$40,000 will be coming from Access Manchester.

Chairman O'Neil asked where does it say that in what we have been presented.

Mr. Maranto answered it is on the CIP start up.

Chairman O'Neil asked which one.

Mr. Maranto answered 510604, Neighborhood Playground Rehab. Under comments it identifies where the funding is coming from. It says \$40,000 from

810103. We have also used those funds at Derryfield to construct an accessible playground there as well in the past through Access Manchester funds.

Chairman O'Neil asked why are you moving it from two other ADA funds.

Mr. Maranto answered we had set aside funds for infrastructure access, which are basically curb cuts. The Highway Department has been looking at several different types of curb cuts and they basically stopped the project to see how they are holding up. They have different types of patterns and Kevin is here and he may be able to address it a little better than I but right now there will be no expenditure of funds until they figure out which ones they want to go with and see how they hold up through the winter. Those funds have been building up and we haven't been spending them. Basically my responsibility is to assure that once we allocate CDBG funds that we expend them in a timely manner by moving them to other projects.

Chairman O'Neil asked are there curb cuts with this project.

Mr. Maranto answered maybe interior sidewalks. We have additional funds above and beyond this for curb cuts. As a matter of fact the Highway Committee did come back to Access Manchester indicating that they would like to hold off on any expenditures probably until the spring until they determine which is the best way to go so they will not be spending those funds.

Chairman O'Neil asked were we guessing. You said that Access Manchester voted on this on Friday. In fact the agenda was prepared before that. Were we guessing that they were going to approve it?

Mr. Maranto answered I would have indicated if they didn't.

Chairman O'Neil asked so this was all prepared without an approval. Did they have a recommendation or do they control the money?

Mr. Maranto answered they make a recommendation.

Chairman O'Neil asked so it could have been done without their recommendation.

Mr. Maranto answered historically we have referred to Access Manchester and now we prioritize the ADA projects.

Chairman O'Neil asked so it was done ahead of time without them voting on it.

Mr. Maranto answered the only way to get it on the agenda was to print it up that way.

Chairman O'Neil stated we need to be careful about that in the future please. It is not a good practice.

Alderman Lopez stated I sit on that Committee and maybe Sam at some future date you could give an update on Access Manchester and what the priority projects are.

Chairman O'Neil asked, Ron, could you just put together not for a presentation but just get something out to the Board showing what you are...I think going forward you are going to need to show the Board what you are going to do at some of these parks. We don't have any idea so if you can give us some idea...is there a designer on board or are you designing in-house.

Mr. Johnson answered we have a design in place right now. Just to follow-up to the ADA issue I know we actually went to the Planning Department and made the case. Sam mentioned when we worked up at Derryfield we worked with the VNA and several other groups to get...they were pushing to get accessible playgrounds and in this particular neighborhood we also have Easter Seals nearby and the Salvation Army so there is a need in that community for the accessible playground. We can provide an update. That is no problem.

Chairman O'Neil stated there should be a need in every playground to make it accessible.

Mr. Johnson answered we are required to do that now.

Chairman O'Neil asked could you get that out to the entire Board showing what your intent is there so we don't have any surprises.

Mr. Johnson answered yes.

On motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted to approve the resolution and budget authorizations.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 12 of the agenda:

Resolution and budget authorization authorizing transfer and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$12,000 (Other) for CIP 711004 Annual ROW Maintenance Project.

Alderman Smith stated Kevin I know this is a donation from Colonial Village and I guess we are going to do the work. Is this a normal practice that you receive money and pave the streets right outside the residence?

Mr. Sheppard replied this was a request made by the ownership at Colonial Village to split the cost of resurfacing the streets in that area. We viewed the streets and felt that it was needed and we felt that it was reasonable to split the cost 50/50 to get that job done.

On motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to approve the resolution and budget authorization.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 13 of the agenda:

CIP Budget Authorizations:

FY1999 CIP 410399 – Cops More 98

FY2002 CIP 411402 – Weed and Seed Pilot Program

FY2004 CIP 210004 - Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Smith it was voted to approve the CIP budget authorizations.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 14 of the agenda:

Communication from Robert MacKenzie, Planning Director, regarding a request that the City consider making various safety and aesthetic improvements along Dean Avenue at a cost of \$9,800.

Alderman Lopez asked Mr. MacKenzie is this normal or is this going to open up a flood of people coming in and asking us to do things. Maybe you can elaborate a little bit on it.

Mr. MacKenzie answered we do occasionally get requests in from property owners to have their sidewalk improved. Sometimes that is done under the 50/50 Program and other times the City has actually gone out and done the whole project. It is a case by case basis. I believe this applicant felt that most of the other...Elm Street was reconstructed a couple of years ago and many of the sidewalks and the side streets have been but Dean Avenue was not. If you are familiar with Dean Avenue it is just a small pedestrian way that extends from Elm Street out to Franklin Street. At this point we don't really have any recommendation on this proposal but we did want to bring it forward to the Committee to see how they felt about it.

Alderman Lopez asked have you, Kevin, looked at this and weighed in on it.

Mr. Sheppard answered I have taken a quick look at the attachment here and based on the numbers that are here they seem reasonable but I guess it comes down to a policy decision.

Chairman O'Neil asked are there other types of Dean Avenues in the City of Manchester.

Mr. MacKenzie answered there are very few pedestrian only right-of-ways in the City. There are less than a handful.

Alderman Lopez stated I am just wondering about the \$9,800 and if the Highway Department could do this for less money.

Chairman O'Neil asked may I make a suggestion and I don't know if the Deputy Director has had a chance to look at this in great detail but maybe just have one of your engineers take a look and confirm the numbers to make sure that they are...we are pretty much from what I read here handing them \$9,800 and saying go do it. I am not sure that is the precedent we want to set.

Alderman Shea moved to table this item. Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion.

Chairman O'Neil stated we can ask the Highway Department to take a look at it. Maybe they can do it in-house. Maybe they can do it as part of there...Kevin are you building brick sidewalks at all around the City or is that...

Mr. Sheppard interjected right now I don't believe we have any contractors but if the Committee would recommend to move forward on this I would recommend that a City department or the Highway Department put this out to contract.

Chairman O'Neil stated okay we will just ask you to take a look at it and confirm the number and let us know what the best avenue is for constructing it.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 16 of the agenda:

Communication from Kevin Sheppard, Deputy Public Works Director, requesting the reassignment of four police cruisers.

On motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to approve the request.

Mr. Sheppard stated I just want to make one point. One of those police cruisers that was supposed to come to the Highway Department will probably be actually utilized as a pool vehicle. It has come to our attention that there are actually two City pool vehicles that are in tough shape so Highway will get one, the pool will get one, Welfare and Building.

Chairman O'Neil stated keep on us in the next budget about we have been promising you that we were going to do something with vehicles. Keep on us about that.

Mr. Sheppard responded these are those police cruisers that the Chief spoke about earlier that they can't use.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 17 of the agenda:

Communication from Bruce Thomas, Engineering Manager, regarding a request to install sewer service to the Junior Deb Softball field near the West Side Arena at a cost of approximately \$15,000.

Alderman Forest stated I approached Frank Thomas about this in the summer. West Junior Deb is located behind the West Side Arena ice rink. The reason I approached Frank Thomas and I did talk to Ron Ludwig about it so they are in agreement is the baseball fields behind the arena are now being utilized by the West High girl's softball and by soccer and by ASA and Babe Ruth baseball and the league that is present down there. They only have a 5,000 gallon septic tank for their leaching system. The tank was not designed to have that many people there every day and every weekend from April through October and on two occasions this summer, both in July, they had two tournaments with approximately 1,700 people per tournament and the septic tanks backed up and they couldn't use them. That is the reason I approached Frank Thomas to ask if there was any way of getting sewage down there to prevent this. Frank and Kevin and Bruce Thomas did an engineering study down there. They did some plans to run sewage and because of environmental issues the sewage had to be run from the front of the arena and not the back but the Highway Department did an engineering thing. They have a plan ready to go and this is the cost and I asked them to make this request for the \$15,000. Again it is for safety and environmental issues.

Chairman O'Neil asked, Bob, I know that at the last few minutes you have been getting pulled to try to identify money. Is this allowable under our I want to say chronic drain program and I don't know what the funding is that is available.

Mr. Sheppard answered no.

Mr. MacKenzie stated it was rattling around in my head as chronic sewer and drain but maybe that is the wrong title.

Mr. Sheppard responded those have been split up. Sewer is actually done under the Environmental Protection Division now so it is strictly a chronic drain program and I am not too sure that I see this being done under EPD funds because it is basically a sewer service.

Chairman O'Neil asked and we have never done that.

Mr. Sheppard answered not installed a service for one user. We have done main extensions to neighborhoods.

Chairman O'Neil asked so we could be setting a precedent then by doing it that way.

Mr. Sheppard answered right.

Chairman O'Neil stated try to identify where we could come up with the funds to do it. You probably wouldn't do it at this point until the spring anyway?

Mr. Sheppard replied actually if we did get the funding it would be a decent winter project. We could do it next year but we like to look for projects that are off the road or off the streets during the winter.

Chairman O'Neil asked so you would work it during the winter.

Mr. Sheppard answered yes that is potentially a winter project.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I think it would be reasonable at least to ask that EPD determine whether they would extend the sewer for a City piece of property. They may come back and say no but this is not like it is a single private piece of property that they are asking a special extension for. This is a City piece and perhaps I could just verify yes or no whether it could be done under sewer funds.

Chairman O'Neil asked even though we have EPD sitting right here tonight we are asking Mr. Sheppard to take a look at that and see what can be done.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I think it is worth a shot just to see whether under their regulations it would be allowable.

Alderman Shea moved to approve the request and ask City staff to work on identifying the funding source. Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion. Chairman O'Neil called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Shea asked could we have an answer by the next CIP meeting.

Chairman O'Neil answered yes.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 18 of the agenda:

Petition to discontinue a portion of Hobart Street from Sherburne Street to Bridge Street Extension.

Alderman Smith moved to recommend that Hobart Street having never been opened, built, nor used for public travel be released and discharged pursuant to RSA 231:51.

Alderman Shea stated I am not sure that Frank Thomas is recommending that.

Mr. Sheppard stated the recommendation is basically the Aldermen do not have to take action on this because it does not have public status and does not need to be discontinued. I believe the City Clerk in the past has written a letter to the petitioner expressing that the City has not interest in that and I think that is all that is needed.

Chairman O'Neil stated we have had a few of these recently where we really didn't have to take any action, correct. So, should we receive and file this?

Clerk Thibault stated the motion that is on the agenda is the motion that should be taken.

Mr. Sheppard responded the City Clerk has worked out the motion.

Chairman O'Neil asked so what is written there is the correct motion.

Clerk Thibault answered yes.

Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion to recommend that Hobart Street having never been opened, built, nor used for public travel be released and discharged pursuant to RSA 231:51. Chairman O'Neil called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

TABLED ITEMS

- 19.** Communication from Kevin Sheppard submitting a draft policy/procedure for Fleet Management/Motorized Equipment.

On motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted to remove this item from the table.

Mr. Sheppard stated we received comments from all of the departments. The Airport Authority has actually requested that we make some specific changes that would pertain to the Airport Authority. We have done that. The revised policy has been sent back out to all department heads and I am expecting their response back by the next CIP Committee meeting.

Chairman O'Neil asked do you want to put this back on the table or are you going to bring a new one forward.

Mr. Sheppard answered I recommend putting it back on the table and I believe I will have something for you at the next meeting.

Alderman Lopez stated I just want to double check one thing. Has the Solicitor reviewed this?

Mr. Sheppard responded it has been sent to the Solicitor's Office.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold stated I couldn't speak for Mr. Clark. I believe he has reviewed it.

Alderman Lopez stated Tom if you take a look at specifically number 5 under B Official Travel and Limited Travel regarding transporting people to work and school while driving to work I just want to know if we have any liability and stuff like that before this is finally approved. I know you can't give me an answer tonight but can you work with Tom Clark to make sure that when you bring this back we are not in any liability?

Deputy Solicitor Arnold responded yes.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Smith, it was voted to put this item back on the table.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Smith, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee